

## **Environmental Review Update Checklist Form**

**1. Project Title and Project Numbers:**

San Diego County Climate Action Plan

**2. Lead agency name and address:**

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B  
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

- a. Contact: Anna Lowe, Project Manager
- b. Phone Number: (858) 694-3704
- c. Email: anna.lowe@sdcounty.ca.gov

**3. Project applicant's name and address:**

County of San Diego  
Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B  
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

**4. Summary of the activities authorized by present action (adoption of the Climate Action Plan):**

The County of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP) provides the specific details associated with County of San Diego General Plan (General Plan) strategies and measures for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions that were not available during the program-level analysis of the General Plan. Adoption of the County CAP, implementation of the CAP measures, and approval of the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change (Significance Guidelines) are intended to reduce GHG emissions within the County in areas over which the County has jurisdictional and operational control, assist in addressing the issue of climate change, and fulfill the County's role as an "essential partner" in achieving statewide goals for emissions reductions. These can be achieved while maintaining consistency with the policies and goals set forth in the 2011 General Plan.

Specific regulation that relates to climate change and GHG reduction includes Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the *California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*, which requires California to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 also directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop and implement regulations that reduce statewide GHG emissions. The *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan) was approved by CARB in December 2008 and outlines the state's plan to achieve the GHG reductions required in AB 32. Regulations aimed at reducing GHG emissions have been adopted at the state level;

however, state actions alone will not meet the overall goal of AB 32. CARB recommended a GHG reduction goal for local governments of 15% below 2005-2008 levels by 2020 to ensure that municipal and community-wide emissions match the state's reduction target.

Currently, there are no legislative requirements for achieving reductions beyond 2020, but the County acknowledges Executive Order (EO) S-3-05, which sets a GHG-emissions reduction goal of 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Therefore, the County projected emissions to 2050 and performed a GHG-reduction scenario to demonstrate additional GHG reductions beyond 2020 to 2035. The County would need to reduce 2035 emissions to 49% below 2005 levels in order to continue along the path toward the EO 2050 goal. Increasing community participation in GHG-reduction measures will achieve additional reductions beyond 2020; however, meeting a 49% reduction goal from 2005 levels will require improved technology and additional state and federal regulations. At this time, anticipating such changes would be considered too speculative for evaluation; therefore, under CEQA Guidelines 15145, the CAP, the Significance Guidelines, and relevant environmental assessments focus on meeting a 2020 reduction goal.

The overall goal of the CAP is to reduce the County's 2005 baseline community emissions by 15% by 2020. The CAP project site includes the entire area of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County.

Through the CAP development process, the County evaluated the current state of resource consumption in the unincorporated County through a baseline GHG emissions inventory. The baseline GHG emissions inventory allows the County to evaluate GHG-emitting activities under its jurisdictional and operational control, and convert the emissions from those activities into a common metric: metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e).

Based on the GHG inventory, the measures in the CAP have been identified as potential GHG Reduction Measures. These Reduction Measures have been applied to the projected GHG inventory to estimate GHG reductions associated with their implementation. The CAP identifies the primary sectors (waste, water and wastewater, energy, land use and transportation, and agriculture, and other sources for the community-wide inventory), which, in addition to adopted state measures, demonstrate how the County achieves its GHG reduction target for 2020. The CAP Reduction Measures include encouraging the planting of trees; conserving water; reducing energy use (through efficiency requirements and retrofits, appliance upgrades, solar water heating, alternate energy systems, and utilizing the smart grid system); and promoting mixed-use development, efficient transportation (transit, bike, walk, rideshare, electric vehicles), and improved agricultural practices. Further, the CAP includes Reduction Measures that will be implemented within the County's internal operations. These Reduction Measures include reducing energy consumption, increasing energy-efficient new construction, increasing renewable

energy use, increase fleet and fuel efficiency, and using monitoring and tracking resources on major facilities to evaluate performance (Chapter 4 in the CAP).

The CAP includes GHG Reduction Measures that, if fully implemented, would achieve an emissions reduction target consistent with, and supportive of, the state-mandated reduction target embodied in AB 32. For some project types, many of the CAP Reduction Measures would be relevant and should be incorporated as part of project design or mitigation. For other project types, there may be fewer applicable CAP reduction measures. Table 1 identifies the goals of the CAP and the Reduction Measures identified to achieve these goals.

**Table 1**  
**San Diego County Climate Action Plan**  
**GHG Reduction Measures**

Measure Number	Measure	Metric Tons (MT) of CO <sub>2</sub> e per Year Reduced from 2020 Business-as-Usual Emissions	Scaled Measure Performance (% Reduction in GHG Emissions)
<b>Landscaping and Open Space</b>			
LS1	Plant Trees	2,475	0.3%
<b>Water</b>			
W1	Conserve Water	20,200	1.4%
<b>Energy</b>			
E1	Efficiency Requirements for New Development	12,997	0.9%
E2.1	Residential Building Retrofits	27,999	1.9%
E2.2	Commercial Building Retrofits	5,257	0.4%
E3	Appliance Upgrade	20,060	1.4%
E4	Smart Meters	8,880	0.6%
R1	Solar Water Heating (Residential and Commercial)	37,618	2.6%
R2	Alternative Energy Systems (Residential and Commercial)	45,290	3.1%
<b>Land Use</b>			
LU1	Mixed-Use Development	124,180	8.5%
<b>Transportation</b>			
T1	Increase Transit Use	62,090	4.2%
T2	Increase Biking and Walking	93,135	6.4%
T3	Increase Ride Sharing	93,135	6.4%
T4	Electric Vehicles	93,135	6.4%

<b>Agriculture</b>			
A1	Nitrogen Optimization	199	0.0%
A2	Field Equipment Fuel Efficiency	4,433	0.3%
A3	Agriculture Irrigation Pump Efficiency	1,826	0.1%
<b>TOTAL COUNTY ACTION</b>		<b>652,909</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>State and Federal</b>			
SF1	Pavley I & II – Passenger Auto and Light Truck Fuel Efficiency	416,210	28.4%
SF2	Low Carbon Fuel Standard	175,075	12.0%
SF3	Renewable Portfolio Standard	200,665	13.7%
SF4	T-4 Tire Pressure Program	8,482	0.6%
SF5	T-7 HDV [Heavy Duty Vehicle] GHG Emissions Reduction Measure – Aerodynamic	9,753	0.7%
<b>Total State and Federal Action</b>		<b>810,185</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>Total Reductions (County, State, and Federal Actions)</b>		<b>1,463,094</b>	<b>100%</b>
2020 Emissions with Reduction Measures		3,729,595	
Percent Reduction below 2005 Baseline Emissions (4,512,580 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e)		17.4%	

To further ensure that the project-level GHG emissions also meet the goals of AB 32, the County has prepared a companion set of quantified GHG emissions thresholds called Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change (Significance Guidelines) as a supplement to the measures outlined in the CAP that would be applied on a project-by-project basis. Thus, the overall community-wide GHG emissions reduction goals are demonstrated through the CAP and individual project compliance is demonstrated through the Significance Guidelines. The dual approach of using the County's CAP and Significance Guidelines provides the flexibility needed to address GHG emissions for the diverse range of projects considered by the County, while also maintaining certainty that the County's reduction targets will actually be met and that new development in the County will achieve its fair share of emissions reductions needed to reach the AB 32 mandate statewide.

Projects that could have cumulatively considerable GHG emissions impacts should incorporate relevant measures from the County's CAP and implement the Significance Guidelines. Implementing the Significance Guidelines includes identifying the appropriate implementing threshold(s) for the project type. Table 4 in the Significance Guidelines provides guidance for determining the appropriate threshold(s)—Efficiency Threshold, Bright Line Threshold, Stationary Source Threshold, or Performance Threshold—to assess significance. Table 2 lists the

guidelines for determining significance. These Significance Guidelines provide ways to determine whether a project will result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change.

**Table 2**  
**Guidelines for Determining**  
**Significance of GHG Impacts of Projects**

<b>County Guideline</b>	<b>Threshold For Determining Significance</b>
Efficiency Threshold	<i>A proposed plan or project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change impacts if it would result in a net increase of construction and operational greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, at a level exceeding 4.32 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year per service population.</i>
Bright Line Threshold	<i>A proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change impacts if it would result in a net increase of operational GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, at a level exceeding 2,500 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year.</i>
Stationary Source Threshold	<i>A proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change impacts if it would result in a net increase of GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, at a level exceeding 10,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year.</i>
Performance Threshold	<i>A proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change impacts if it would result in a net increase of construction and operational GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, and if the project would incorporate mitigation that achieves less than a 16% total reduction compared to unmitigated emissions.</i>

**5. Does the project for which a subsequent discretionary action (adoption of the CAP) is now proposed differ in any way from the previously approved project (General Plan)?**

YES

☒

NO

☐

If yes, describe **ALL** differences.

The CAP is a compilation of a number of programs and policies that are included in the County of San Diego General Plan. Not only did the General Plan include the commitment to prepare a CAP but all measures in the CAP are represented in the County's General Plan by policy or General Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) mitigation measure. What the CAP does differently than the General Plan is that it elaborates on each measure, providing greater specificity on anticipated implementation and achievable emission reductions. The Significance Guidelines provide additional detail regarding how future projects should assess significance related to climate change. The Significance Guidelines would serve as administrative guidance to provide a consistent, objective, and predictable evaluation of significant project effects relative to climate change and associated factors. The Significance Guidelines have been drafted to provide the framework to ensure that future County projects achieve greater energy, water, waste, and transportation efficiency as required by the General Plan.

The County of San Diego General Plan specifically calls for preparation, maintenance, and implementation of a CAP:

***COS-20.1 Climate Change Action Plan.*** Prepare, maintain, and implement a climate change action plan with a baseline inventory of GHG emissions from all sources, GHG emissions reduction targets and deadlines, and enforceable GHG emissions reduction measures.

In addition, the General Plan Program EIR included mitigation measure CC-1.2, Preparation of a CAP, which called for a baseline GHG emissions inventory; detailed GHG-reduction targets and deadlines; comprehensive and enforceable GHG emissions-reduction measures; and implementation, monitoring, and reporting of progress toward the targets defined in the CAP:

***Mitigation Measure CC-1.2.*** Prepare a County Climate Change Action Plan with an update baseline inventory of greenhouse gas emissions from all sources, more detailed greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets and deadlines; and a comprehensive and enforceable GHG emissions reduction measures that will achieve a 17% reduction in emissions from County operations from 2006 by 2020 and a 9% reduction in community emissions between 2006 and 2020. Once prepared, implementation of the plan will be monitored and progress reported on a regular basis.

The General Plan Program EIR included mitigation measure CC-1.8, Revise County Guidelines for Determining Significance:

***Mitigation Measure CC-1.8. Revise County Guidelines for Determining Significance based on the Climate Change Action Plan. The revisions will include guidance for proposed discretionary projects to achieve greater energy, water, waste, and transportation efficiency.***

Further, multiple policies in the General Plan and Program EIR mitigation measures would ultimately serve to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through actions such as increased energy efficiency, water conservation, reduced vehicle miles traveled, smart growth initiatives, recycling, preserving natural areas, and other similar types of measures. The introduction to the General Plan (starting on page 15) provides a full description of how the General Plan works to reduce fossil fuel consumption and reduce GHG emissions. Table 3 lists policies in the General Plan that specifically address GHG emissions and the reduction of fossil fuel use.

**Table 3**  
**General Plan Policies Addressing Climate Change**

OBJECTIVE A: MITIGATION—REDUCTION IN GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
Strategy A-1: Reduce vehicle trips generated, gasoline/energy consumption, and greenhouse gas emissions		
Element	Policies	
Land Use	<div> <div> LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development  LU-1.3 Development Patterns  LU-1.4 Village Expansion  LU-3.3 Complete Neighborhoods  LU-5.1 Reduction of Vehicle Trips within Communities  LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design  LU-5.4 Planning Support  LU-5.5 Projects that Impede Non-Motorized Travel  LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design  LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design  LU-9.5 Village Uses </div> <div> LU-9.7 Town Center Planning and Design  LU-9.8 Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas  LU-9.10 Internal Village Connectivity  LU-9.12 Achieving Planned Densities in Villages  LU-10.1 Residential Connectivity  LU-10.4 Commercial and Industrial Development  LU-11.1 Location and Connectivity  LU-11.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Centers  LU-11.6 Office Development  LU-11.8 Permitted Secondary Uses </div> </div>	
Mobility	<div> <div> M-1.2 Interconnected Road Network  M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way  M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation  M-4.1 Walkable Village Roads  M-4.2 Interconnected Local Roads  M-4.3 Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character  M-5.1 Regional Coordination  M-6.5 Adaptive Reuse of Abandoned Rail Lines  M-8.1 Maximize Transit Service Opportunities  M-8.2 Transit Service to Key Community Facilities and Services  M-8.3 Transit Stops That Facilitate Ridership  M-8.4 Transit Amenities  M-8.5 Improved Transit Facilities  M-8.6 Park and Ride Facilities </div> <div> M-10.2 Parking for Pedestrian Activity  M-10.3 Maximize On-Street Parking  M-10.5 Reduced Parking  M-10.6 On-Street Parking  M-11.1 Bicycle Facility Design  M-11.2 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Development  M-11.3 Bicycle Facilities on Roads Designated in the Mobility Element  M-11.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity  M-11.5 Funding for Bicycle Network Improvements  M-11.6 Coordination for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Connectivity  M-11.7 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design  M-11.8 Coordination with the County Trails Program  M-12.1 County Trails System </div> </div>	

	M-8.7 Inter-Regional Travel Modes M-8.8 Shuttles M-9.1 Transportation Systems Management M-9.2 Transportation Demand Management M-9.3 Preferred Parking M-9.4 Park-and-Ride Facilities M-10.1 Parking Capacity	M-12.2 Trail Variety M-12.3 Trail Planning M-12.4 Land Dedication for Trails M-12.5 Future Trails M-12.6 Trail Easements, Dedications, and Joint-Use Agreements M-12.7 Funding for Trails M-12.8 Trails on Private Lands
Housing	H-1.2 Development Intensity Relative to Permitted Density H-1.3 Housing near Public Services H-1.4 Special Need Housing near Complementary Uses	H-1.5 Senior and Affordable Housing near Shopping and Services H-1.6 Land for All Housing Types Provided in Villages H-1.7 Mix of Residential Development Types in Villages
<b>Strategy A-2: Reduce non-renewable electrical and natural gas energy consumption and generation (energy efficiency)</b>		
Land Use	LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design	
Conservation and Open Space	COS-6.5 Best Management Practices COS-14.4 Sustainable Technology and Projects COS-14.5 Building Siting and Orientation in Subdivisions COS-14.6 Solar Access for Infill Development COS-14.7 Alternative Energy Sources for Development Projects	COS-14.12 Heat Island Effect COS-15.1 Design and Construction of New Buildings COS-15.2 Upgrade of Existing Buildings COS-15.3 Green Building Programs COS-15.4 Title 24 Energy Standards COS-15.5 Energy Efficiency Audits
<b>Strategy A-3: Increase generation and use of renewable energy sources</b>		
Land Use	LU-4.6 Planning for Adequate Energy Facilities	LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design
Conservation and Open Space	COS-6.5 Best Management Practices COS-14.4 Sustainable Technology and Projects COS-14.5 Building Siting and Orientation in Subdivisions COS-14.6 Solar Access for Infill Development COS-14.7 Alternative Energy Sources for Development Projects	COS-15.3 Green Building Programs COS-16.4 Alternative Fuel Sources COS-15.2 Upgrade of Existing Buildings COS-17.5 Methane Recapture COS-18.1 Alternate Energy Systems COS-18.2 Energy Generation from Waste
<b>Strategy A-4: Reduce water consumption</b>		
Land Use	LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability	LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-16.3 New Waste Management Facilities
Conservation and Open Space	COS-10.7 Recycling of Debris COS-14.4 Sustainable Technology and Projects COS-15.1 Design and Construction of New Buildings COS-15.2 Upgrade of Existing Buildings COS-15.3 Green Building Programs COS-17.1 Reduction of Solid Waste Materials	COS-17.2 Construction and Demolition Waste COS-17.4 Composting COS-17.6 Recycling Containers COS-17.7 Material Recovery Program COS-18.2 Energy Generation from Waste
<b>Strategy A-6: Promote carbon dioxide consuming landscapes</b>		
Land Use	LU-1.3 Development Patterns LU-2.5 Greenbelts to Define Communities LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design LU-5.3 Rural Land Preservation LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.2 Reducing Development Pressures LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design	LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development LU-7.2 Parcel Size Reduction as Incentive for Agriculture LU-9.10 Internal Village Connectivity
Conservation and Open Space	COS-14.4 Sustainable Technology and Projects	COS-14.11 Native Vegetation
<b>Strategy A-7: Maximize preservation of open spaces, natural areas, and agricultural lands</b>		



Land Use	LU-1.3 Development Patterns LU-1.4 Village Expansion LU-1.6 Conversion of Public Lands to Private Ownership LU-3.3 Complete Neighborhoods LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design LU-5.3 Rural Land Preservation LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.2 Reducing Development Pressures LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design	LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design LU-6.7 Open Space Network LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development LU-7.2 Parcel Size Reduction as Incentive for Agriculture LU-9.11 Integration of Natural Features in Villages LU-10.2 Development—Environmental Resource Relationship
Mobility	M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design	
Conservation and Open Space	COS-1.1 Coordinated Preserve System COS-1.2 Minimize Impacts COS-1.3 Management COS-1.4 Collaboration with other Jurisdictions COS-1.5 Regional Collaboration COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement COS-2.2 Habitat Protection Through Site Design	COS-3.1 Wetland Protection COS-3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development COS-7.2 Open Space Easements COS-14.11 Native Vegetation COS-23.2 Regional Coordination COS-24.1 Park and Recreation Contributions COS-24.2 Funding Opportunities
<b>OBJECTIVE B: ADAPTATION—ADAPTING CURRENT STRATEGIES SO THAT CLIMATE CHANGE IS INTEGRAL TO PLANNING ACTIVITIES AND DECISIONS</b>		
<b>Strategy B-1: Reduce risk from wildfire, flooding, and other hazards resulting from climate change</b>		
Land Use	LU-1.2 Leapfrog Development LU-1.4 Village Expansion LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design LU-5.3 Rural Land Preservation LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Project Design LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design	LU-6.7 Open Space Network LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography LU-6.10 Protection from Hazards LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards LU-6.12 Flooding
Mobility	M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design	
Conservation and Open Space	COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains COS-5.3 Downslope Protection	COS-5.4 Invasive Species COS-14.4 Sustainable Technology and Projects
Safety	S-1.3 Risk Reduction Programs S-2.2 Participation in Mutual Aid Systems S-2.3 Familiarity with National and State Response Plans S-2.5 Existing Development within 100-year Flood Zones S-2.6 Effective Emergency Evacuation Programs S-3.1 Defensible Development S-3.2 Development in Hillsides and Canyons S-3.3 Minimize Flammable Vegetation S-3.4 Service Availability S-3.5 Access Roads S-3.6 Fire Protection Measures S-4.1 Fuel Management Programs S-5.1 Regional Coordination Support	S-5.2 Fire Service Provider Agreements S-6.1 Water Supply S-6.4 Fire Protection Services for Development S-9.1 Floodplain Maps S-9.2 Development in Floodplains S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas S-9.4 Development in Villages S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe S-9.6 Development in Dam Inundation Areas S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways S-10.2 Use of Natural Channels S-10.3 Flood Control Facilities S-10.4 Stormwater Management S-10.5 Development Site Improvements S-10.6 Stormwater Hydrology
<b>Strategy B-2: Conserve &amp; improve water supply due to shortages from climate change</b>		
Land Use	LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design LU-6.2 Reducing Development Pressures	LU-8.2 Groundwater Resources LU-8.3 Groundwater-Dependent Habitat

	LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-6.5 Sustainable Stormwater Management LU-6.98 Development Conformance with Topography LU-8.1 Density Relationship to Groundwater Sustainability	LU-8.4 Program for Borrego Valley Aquifer LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply LU-13.2 Commitment of Water Supply LU-16.1 Location of Waste Management Facilities
Mobility	M-2.5 Minimize Excess Water Runoff	M-10.7 Parking Area Design for Stormwater Runoff
Conservation and Open Space	COS-4.1 Water Conservation COS-4.2 Drought-Efficient Landscaping COS-4.3 Stormwater Filtration COS-4.4 Groundwater Contamination COS-4.5 Recycled Water COS-5.2 Impervious Surfaces	COS-5.5 Impacts of Development to Water Quality COS-14.4 Sustainable Technology and Projects COS-19.1 Sustainable Development Practices COS-19.2 Recycled Water in New Development
<b>Strategy B-3: Promote agricultural lands for local food production</b>		
Land Use	LU-1.3 Development Patterns LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design LU-5.3 Rural Land Preservation LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability LU-6.2 Reducing Development Pressures LU-6.3 Compatibility with Recreational Open Space	LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development LU-7.2 Parcel Size Reduction as Incentive for Agriculture LU-12.9 Environmental and Agricultural Resources
Conservation and Open Space	COS-6.1 Economic Diversity COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations	COS-6.4 Conservation Easements
Housing	H-3.6 Housing for Special Need Populations	H-3.7 Alternative Affordable Housing Options
<b>Strategy B-4: Provide education &amp; leadership</b>		
Conservation and Open Space	COS-17.8 Education COS-20.1 Climate Change Action Plan	COS-20.2 GHG Monitoring and Implementation COS-20.4 Public Education
Safety	S-2.4 Emergency and Disaster Education Programs	

Additionally, the General Plan Program EIR requires various mitigation measures. The mitigation measures from the General Plan Program EIR listed below are designed to reduce impacts from GHG emissions to below a level of significance. Other measures beyond those listed below are included in the General Plan Program EIR that would also reduce GHG emissions, such as water conservation measures, traffic reduction measures, etc.

**CC-1.1** Update the County Green Building Program to increase effectiveness of encouraging incentives for development that is energy efficient and conserves resources through incentives and education.

**CC-1.2** Prepare a County Climate Change Action Plan with an update baseline inventory of greenhouse gas emissions from all sources, more detailed greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets and deadlines; and a comprehensive and enforceable GHG emissions reduction measures that will achieve a 17% reduction in emissions from County operations from 2006 by 2020 and a 9% reduction in community emissions between 2006 and 2020. Once

prepared, implementation of the plan will be monitored and progress reported on a regular basis.

**CC-1.3** Work with SANDAG to achieve regional goals in reducing GHG emissions associated with land use and transportation.

**CC-1.4** Review traffic operations to implement measures that improve flow and reduce idling such as improving traffic signal synchronization and decreasing stop rate and time.

**CC-1.5** Coordinate with the San Diego County Water Authority and other water agencies to better link land use planning with water supply planning with specific regard to potential impacts from climate change and continued implementation and enhancement of water conservation programs to reduce demand. Also support water conservation pricing (e.g., tiered rate structures) to encourage efficient water use.

**CC-1.6** Implement and expand County-wide recycling and composting programs for residents and businesses. Require commercial and industrial recycling.

**CC-1.7** Incorporate the California ARB's recommendations for a climate change CEQA threshold into the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change. These recommendations will include energy, waste, water, and transportation performance measures for new discretionary projects in order to reduce GHG emissions. Should the recommendation not be released in a timely manner, the County will prepare its own threshold.

**CC-1.8** Revise County Guidelines for Determining Significance based on the Climate Change Action Plan. The revisions will include guidance for proposed discretionary projects to achieve greater energy, water, waste, and transportation efficiency.

**CC-1.9** Coordinate with APCD, SDG&E, and the California Center for Sustainable Energy to research and possibly develop a mitigation credit program. Under this program, mitigation funds will be used to retrofit existing buildings for energy efficiency to reduce GHG emissions.

**CC-1.10** Continue to implement the County Groundwater Ordinance, Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO), Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), MSCP and prepare MSCP Plans for North and East County in order to further preserve wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, groundwater recharge areas and other open space that provide carbon sequestration benefits and to restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles. The WPO also implements low-impact development practices that maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site to manage storm water and protect the

environment. (Retaining storm water runoff on-site can drastically reduce the need for energy-intensive imported water at the site.)

**CC-1.11** Revise the Ordinance Relating to Water Conservation for Landscaping to further water conservation to:

- Create water-efficient landscapes and use water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls.
- Use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation.
- Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff.
- Provide education about water conservation and available programs and incentives.

**CC-1.12** Continue to coordinate with resource agencies, CALFIRE, and fire districts to minimize potential wildfire risks in the County and to plan for the potential increase in future risk that may result from Climate Change.

**CC-1.13** Continue to implement and revise as necessary the Regional Trails Plan as well as the Community Trails Master Plan to connect parks and publicly accessible open space through shared pedestrian/bike paths and trails to encourage walking and bicycling.

**CC-1.14** Provide public education and information about options for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In addition to addressing land development, education should also address purchasing, conservation, and recycling.

**CC-1.15** Reduce VMT and encourage alternative modes of transportation by implementing the following measures:

- During Community Plan updates, establish policies and design guidelines that: encourage commercial centers in compact walkable configurations and discourage “strip” commercial development
- Expand community bicycle infrastructure.
- Revise the Off-Street Parking Design Manual to include parking placement concepts that encourage pedestrian activity and concepts for providing shared parking facilities.
- Establish comprehensive planning principles for transit nodes such as the Sprinter Station located in North County Metro.
- Continue to locate County facilities near transit facilities whenever feasible.
- Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to maximize opportunities to locate park and ride facilities.
- Continue to coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and transit agencies to expand the mass transit opportunities in the unincorporated county and to

review the location and design of transit stops. Establish a DPLU transit coordinator to ensure land use issues are being addressed.

- Update the Zoning Ordinance to require commercial, office, and industrial development to provide preferred parking for carpools, vanpools, electric vehicles, and flex cars.

**CC-1.16** Develop and implement a Strategic Energy Plan to increase energy efficiency in existing County buildings and set standards for any new County facilities that will ultimately reduce GHG emissions. This will include implementation of the following measures as will be detailed within the Plan:

- Improve energy efficiency within existing operations through retrofit projects, updated purchasing policies, updated maintenance/operations standards, and education.
- Improve energy efficiency of new construction and major renovations by applying design criteria and participating in incentive programs.
- Provide energy in a reliable and cost-effective manner and utilize renewable energy systems where feasible.
- Monitor and reduce energy demand through metering, building controls, and energy monitoring systems.
- Increase County fleet fuel efficiency by acquiring more hybrid vehicles, using alternative fuels, and by maintaining performance standards for all fleet vehicles.

**CC-1.17** Develop and implement a County Operations Recycling Program. This will include implementation of the following measures as will be detailed within the Program:

- Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).
- Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public areas.
- Recover by-product methane to generate electricity.
- Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services.

**CC-1.18** Develop and implement a County Operations Water Conservation Program.

**CC-1.19** Revise the Zoning Ordinance to facilitate recycling salvaged concrete, asphalt, and rock.

**6. SUBJECT AREAS DETERMINED TO HAVE NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS COMPARED TO THOSE IDENTIFIED IN THE PREVIOUS EIR.** The subject areas checked below were

determined to be new significant environmental effects or to be previously identified effects that have a substantial increase in severity either due to a change in project, change in circumstances or new information of substantial importance, as indicated by the checklist and discussion on the following pages.

- ☒ NONE
- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources        | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz.<br>Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality      | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources           | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services             | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cumulative Effects          | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service<br>Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Global Climate Change  |

## 7. CEQA GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERING PREVIOUS EIRs

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously adopted Negative Declaration or previously certified EIR for the project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 allows for tiering of analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as a general plan EIR) with later environmental evaluations of narrower projects. Section 15152(b) states that tiering is appropriate when the sequence of analysis is from an EIR prepared for a general plan, policy, or program to an EIR or negative declaration for another plan, policy, or program of lesser extent, or to a site-specific EIR or negative declaration. Specific to use of a previous Program EIR and use with later activities, Section 15168(c)(2) states that if the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental documentation would be required.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162(a) and 15163 state that when a Negative Declaration has been adopted or an EIR certified for a project, no Subsequent or Supplemental EIR or Subsequent Negative Declaration shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole public record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration; or
  - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previously adopted Negative Declaration or previously certified EIR; or
  - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would, in fact, be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Negative Declaration or EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(a) states that an Addendum to a previously certified EIR may be prepared if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR have occurred.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(b) states that an Addendum to a previously adopted Negative Declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary.

If the factors listed in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, or 15164 have not occurred or are not met, no changes to the previously certified EIR or previously adopted Negative Declaration are necessary.

The CAP and the Significance Guidelines build upon and provide additional detail to policies and mitigation measures adopted in the General Plan and General Plan Program EIR. Therefore, activities associated with the CAP and Significance Guidelines impacting environmental issue areas are determined to be within the scope of the General Plan Program EIR. The CAP, associated Significance Guidelines, and types of projects encouraged as a result of the CAP do not propose or cause a change in circumstances that are substantially different than the conditions considered in the

General Plan Program EIR. The CAP provides the strategies and methods to reduce GHG emissions within the County and address the issue of climate change while meeting the County's planning goals and legislative requirements. The projects that may be encouraged from implementation of the CAP, such as bike and pedestrian pathways, installation of alternate energy systems, retrofits, promoting mixed-use developments, and promoting improved agricultural practices are consistent with the overall development anticipated and planned for in the General Plan. All CAP measures and strategies or those projects encouraged by implementation of the CAP would be required to comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs. The policies stated under specific resources that are analyzed below are incorporated from the 2011 County of San Diego General Plan. Subsequent projects that implement the CAP would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures as analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR in order to streamline under CEQA Guidelines 15168. Therefore, as analyzed and discussed below, there is no new information of substantial importance related to potentially significant environmental effects, and there are no substantial changes to the project or with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken. If a later project includes measures or features that were not analyzed within the scope of the General Plan Program EIR, new environmental evaluation per CEQA, such as an Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration (15168 (c)).

#### **8. DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this analysis, the Department of Planning and Land Use has determined that:

- ☒ The new information included in the CAP and Significance Guidelines represent minor technical additions to the previously certified EIR. No new environmental issues or mitigation measures are identified in the CAP. No substantial changes are proposed in the project, and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous EIR due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, the previously certified EIR is adequate upon completion of an Addendum, as identified in Section 15164(a).
- ☐ No substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, because the project is a residential project in conformance with, and pursuant to, a Specific Plan with an EIR completed after January 1, 1980, the project is exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15182.



- ☐ Substantial changes are proposed in the project or there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous Negative Declaration due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Or, there is "new information of substantial importance," as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). However all new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of previously identified significant effects are clearly avoidable through the incorporation of mitigation measures agreed to by the project applicant. Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT Negative Declaration is required.
- ☐ Substantial changes are proposed in the project or there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous Negative Declaration or EIR due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Or, there is "new information of substantial importance," as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT or SUPPLEMENTAL EIR is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

**Project Manager**  
Title

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UPDATE CHECKLIST**  
**for**  
**COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO CLIMATE ACTION PLAN**

**Ia. AESTHETICS (Scenic Vistas)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a scenic vista that is visible from a:

- Public road;
- Trail within an adopted County or State trail system;
- Scenic vista or highway; or
- Recreational area?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such

as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are called visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

Certain areas in the County have been designated as Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) for the purposes of informing future planning decisions. RCAs include areas of aesthetic quality, groundwater problem areas, coastal wetlands, native wildlife habitats, construction quality sand areas, littoral sand areas, astronomical dark skies areas, scenic geologic formations, and significant archaeological and historical sites. The RCAs in unincorporated San Diego County are considered valuable because of visual resources. A summary of RCAs by Community Plan Areas (CPAs) and subregions is identified in the General Plan Program EIR. A consolidated list of these areas is below:

- Alpine CPA
- Bonsall CPA
- Central Mountain Subregion
- Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills Subregion
- Fallbrook CPA
- Jamul/Dulzura Subregion
- Lakeside CPA
- North County Metro Subregion
- North Mountain Subregion
- Otay Subregion
- Pala/Pauma Valley Subregion
- Rainbow CPA
- Ramona CPA
- San Dieguito CPA
- Sweetwater CPA
- Valley Center CPA

The CAP proposes measures that encourage the installation of photovoltaic (PV) panels and other distributed renewable energy technologies on homes, businesses, and County facilities to provide alternative sources of energy. PV panels could be placed on rooftops, which could potentially alter scenic views for homes or businesses located behind the rooftop panels. However, the PV panels for residential or civic use would likely not be large enough to significantly affect views from other residences located uphill or behind the rooftop panels, especially in areas of the County with a low density of homes and businesses.

Similarly, the CAP mentions facilities such as pedestrian and bicycle paths that would potentially alter scenic vistas. These potential impacts were discussed in the General Plan Program EIR.

Currently there are a number of federal and state regulations, including local regulations such as the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and design guidelines that help protect the County's visual resources. The County Zoning Ordinance contains several regulations that pertain to aesthetic character and resources and implement the design and scenic preservation guidelines. The Scenic Area Regulations of the County Zoning Ordinance serve to regulate development in areas of high scenic value to exclude incompatible uses and structures and preserve and enhance the scenic resources in adjacent areas. These areas are designated with a Scenic Area Designator (Designator S).

The most direct efforts currently taken by the County to minimize impacts to scenic vistas is through CEQA review of discretionary projects. The County has prepared guidelines specifically for reviewing impacts to scenic vistas. With the exception of CEQA review, few of the above regulations directly relate to the preservation of scenic vistas. Furthermore, design review guidelines and special area designators are only implemented in some areas and communities. Therefore, while a number of existing regulations and processes aid in reducing impacts to scenic vistas, they are not comprehensive for the issue. The General Plan contains several goals and policies, beyond those currently in place to protect scenic vistas by requiring development to preserve or conserve scenic features of the County. Goals and policies pertaining to scenic vistas are found in the Land Use, Mobility, and Conservation and Open Space Elements of the General Plan. Project compliance with General Plan policies and General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, along with other existing policies such as the RPO, address potential impacts to scenic vistas.

Implementation of CAP policies and the Significance Guidelines in processing of land use projects could affect scenic vistas. Activities such as the installation of PV panels or construction of facilities could have the potential to be a significant impact; however, consistency and compliance with the County RPO, zoning ordinances, and General Plan policies and mitigation requirements would mitigate potential impacts to scenic vistas to a less than significant impact.

The following are the General Plan policies as they relate to scenic vistas:

Policy LU-6.6: Integration of Natural Features into Project Design. Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.

Policy LU-6.7: Open Space Network. Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors, preserve

scenic vistas and areas, and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.

Policy LU-6.9: Development Conformance with Topography. Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater, to the maximum extent practicable.

Policy COS-11.1: Protection of Scenic Resources. Require the protection of scenic highways, corridors, regionally significant scenic vistas, and natural features, including prominent ridgelines, dominant landforms, reservoirs, and scenic landscapes.

Policy COS-11.2: Scenic Resource Connections. Promote the connection of regionally significant natural features, designated historic landmarks, and points of regional historic, visual, and cultural interest via designated scenic corridors such as scenic highways and regional trails.

Policy COS-11.3: Development Siting and Design. Require development within visually sensitive areas to minimize visual impacts and to preserve unique or special visual features, particularly in rural areas, through the following:

- Creative site planning
- Integration of natural features into the project
- Appropriate scale, materials, and design to complement the surrounding natural landscape
- Minimal disturbance of topography
- Clustering of development so as to preserve a balance of open space vistas, natural features, and community character
- Creation of contiguous open space networks

Policy COS-11.4: Collaboration with Agencies and Jurisdictions. Coordinate with adjacent federal and state agencies, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to protect scenic resources and corridors that extend beyond the County's land use authority, but are important to the welfare of County residents.

Policy COS-11.5: Collaboration with Private and Public Agencies. Coordinate with the California Public Utilities Commission, power companies, and other public agencies to avoid siting energy generation, transmission facilities, and other public improvements in locations that impact visually sensitive areas, whenever feasible. Require the design of public improvements within visually sensitive areas to blend into the landscape.

Future projects implementing the CAP and Significance Guidelines, including projects incorporating tree planting; water conservation; energy reduction (requirements and retrofits, appliance upgrades, solar water heating, alternate energy systems, Smartgrid); mixed-use development; efficient transportation (transit, bike, walk, rideshare, electric), and improved agricultural practices would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs. They would also be subject to the design features and mitigation measures identified below, as analyzed the General Plan Program EIR. If a later project includes aesthetic measures or features that are not within the scope of the General Plan Program EIR, new environmental evaluation per CEQA would be required.

The General Plan Program EIR developed mitigation measures to work with the above policies to mitigate aesthetic impacts to scenic vistas. These are as follows:

Aes-1.2: Protect sensitive biological habitats and species through regulations that require avoidance and mitigation of impacts. Existing programs include the County MSCP [Multiple Species Conservation Program] and associated BMOs [Biological Mitigation Ordinance], RPO, and CEQA Guidelines. While protecting biological resources, these programs also preserve natural open space that contributes to the quality of many of the County's scenic vistas.

Aes-1.7: Develop and implement programs and regulations that preserve agricultural lands (such as the County's CEQA Guidelines and the Farm Program). Most existing agricultural lands are key components of scenic vistas and community character, and the preservation of these resources is critical to minimizing impacts to these resources.

Aes-1.8: Continue to develop and implement programs and regulations that minimize landform alteration and preserve ridgelines and steep slopes where appropriate. Examples include the County's Grading Ordinance, RPO, and CEQA Guidelines.

Aes-1.9: Work with communities and other stakeholders to identify key scenic vistas, viewsheds of County scenic road and highways, and other areas of specific scenic value. Apply Resource Conservation Area designations or other special area designators, guidelines, and tools to guide future development of parcels within these viewsheds to avoid impacts to the scenic vistas.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the associated Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances by which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a scenic vista beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Ib. AESTHETICS (Scenic Resources)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could result in the removal or substantial adverse change of one or more features that contribute to the valued visual character or image of a neighborhood, community, State Scenic Highway, or localized area, including, but not limited to, landmarks (designated), historic resources, trees, and rock outcroppings.?

YES

☐

NO

☒

State Scenic Highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans – California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State Scenic Highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist’s line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The State Scenic Highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

Only two highways in the unincorporated County have been designated as a State Scenic Highway: State Route (SR) 78 through the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and SR-125 between Interstate (I) 8 and SR-94. Eligible scenic highways include portions of I-5, I-15, SR-94, I-8, SR-79, SR-78, and SR-76 within the unincorporated County. Officially designated State Scenic Highway routes receive street signs displaying a poppy logo.

Implementation of CAP policies and Significance Guidelines in processing of land use projects could affect visual character. The CAP encourages installation of PV panels and other distributed renewable energy technologies on homes, businesses, and County facilities to provide alternative sources of energy. PV panels could be placed on rooftops, which could potentially alter scenic views for homes or businesses located behind the rooftop panels. However, the placement of PV panels for residential or civic use would likely not have a substantial effect on scenic resources as these would be small-scale installations and not be of the magnitude to significantly interfere or fully block views of scenic resources for the surrounding areas.

Future projects implementing the CAP measures, such as projects with electricity-generating systems and pedestrian and bicycle trails, would potentially alter scenic views. While existing County policies and regulations and the General Plan goals and policies (listed under Section Ia., above) are intended to protect scenic resources and visual character of communities, the General Plan also contains goals and policies for protection of aesthetic resources by requiring new development to preserve or conserve scenic features. Projects would also be subject to the design features and mitigation

measures as analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR and listed below, as well as under Section Ia.

The following are the General Plan policies as they relate to scenic resources:

Policy LU-2.1: Community Plans. Maintain updated community plans, as part of the General Plan, to guide development to reflect the character and vision for each individual unincorporated community, consistent with the General Plan.

Policy LU-2.5: Greenbelts to Define Communities. Identify and maintain greenbelts between communities to reinforce the identity of individual communities.

Policy LU-10.1: Residential Connectivity. Require residential development in semi-rural areas to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous street, pathway/trail, and recreational open space networks.

Policy LU-10.2: Development Environmental Resource Relationship. Require development in semi-rural and rural areas to respect and conserve the unique natural features and rural character, and avoid sensitive or intact environmental resources and hazard areas.

Policy M-2.3: Environmentally Sensitive Road Design. Locate and design public and private roads to minimize impacts to significant biological and other environmental and visual resources. Avoid road alignments through floodplains to minimize impacts on floodplain habitats and limit the need for constructing flood control measures. Design new roads to maintain wildlife movement and retrofit existing roads for that purpose. Utilize fencing to reduce road kill and to direct animals to under crossings.

Policy M-10.6: On-Street Parking. Minimize on-street vehicular parking outside villages and rural villages where on-street parking is not needed to reduce the width of paved shoulders and provide an opportunity for bicycle lanes to retain rural character in low-intensity areas. Where on-street parking occurs outside villages and rural villages, require the design to be consistent with the rural character.

Policy H-2.1: Development That Respects Community Character. Require that development in existing residential neighborhoods be well designed so as not to degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development, consistent with the Land Use Element.

The General Plan Program EIR developed mitigation measures to work with the above policies to mitigate aesthetic impacts to scenic resources. Measures include those listed above in Ia. and as follows:

Aes-1.6: Require that project approvals with significant potential to adversely affect the scenic quality of a community require community review and specific findings of community compatibility. Examples can be found in the Zoning Ordinance with the numerous special uses or exceptions allowed pursuant to Administrative and Use Permits and Site Plans. This practice has proven useful for reducing impacts to aesthetic resources, and their usefulness will increase as community plans and design guidelines are updated pursuant to Aes-1.3 and Aes-1.4.

Aes-1.10: Participate in regional planning and planning by agencies operating within or adjacent to the County to the extent practicable. This includes participation in SANDAG [San Diego Association of Governments] and other regional planning forums, reviewing and commenting on planning and environmental documents issued by other agencies, and ongoing collaboration with Native American tribes and adjacent jurisdictions.

Aes-3.1: Improve upon the County road standards or other right-of-way design guidelines to provide standards related to road design, parking, landscaping, and elements of the public realm that are critical to the character of a community.

Aes-3.2: Implement existing and prepare new community right-of-way development standards, as appropriate, that supplement the County road standards in order to recognize the unique constraints and character of different communities.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could cause removal or substantial adverse change of one or more features that contribute to the valued visual character or image of a neighborhood, community, State Scenic Highway, or localized area, beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Ic. AESTHETICS (Visual Character or Quality)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings by introducing features that would detract from or contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of a neighborhood, community, or localized area by conflicting with important visual elements or the quality of the area (such as theme, style, setbacks, density, size, massing, coverage, scale, color, architecture, building materials, etc.) or by being inconsistent with applicable design guidelines.?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒



San Diego County has three distinctive geographic regions that provide a backdrop for visual resources: the low-lying coastal plain, the mountainous peninsular range, and the lowlands of the desert. The diversity of these regions provides the County residents and visitors with an array of natural vistas and scenic environments that provide a unique aesthetic collection from the ocean to the desert. Urban land uses are focused in the western one-third of the County, while the eastern two-thirds are largely undeveloped, with mountains and desert dominating the landscape. Throughout these three distinctive geographic provinces are vast amounts of publicly owned lands that provide open space and visual relief from the human-made environment. Examples include the U.S. Marine Corps (USMC) Base Camp Pendleton on the coastal plain in northern San Diego County, the Cleveland National Forest in the peninsular range, and Anza-Borrego Desert State Park in the desert region. In addition to these examples of large expanses of open space, County parks, habitat preserves, reservoirs, farmland, and undeveloped lands contribute to the County's open space lands and overall aesthetic resource value.

Primary aesthetic resources in the coastal plain region are coastlines, bays, lagoons, canyons, mesas, natural vegetation, historic or unique structures, and agricultural lands. Notable scenic resources in the peninsular range foothills are the Otay River, Sweetwater River, upper San Diego River, Upper and Lower Otay Lakes, Sweetwater Reservoir, Lake Hodges, and San Vicente Reservoir. Scenic resources in the higher elevation of the peninsular range region are plentiful, including large open spaces such as Cleveland National Forest, Agua Tibia Wilderness Area, San Mateo Canyon Wilderness, Palomar Mountain State Park, Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, and various County reserves and parks, as well as the large water bodies of El Capitan Reservoir, Barrett Lake, Lake Morena, Lake Cuyamaca, and Lake Henshaw.

Most of the desert region is located within the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, a valuable visual resource that provides scenic beauty for many visitors. The desert region also provides expansive views characterized by dramatic landforms, native desert habitat, and low desert valleys.

For implementation of CAP policies and Significance Guidelines in processing land use projects, the measures could encourage development to occur that would have the potential to remove or change a feature that contributes to the valued visual character or image of the neighborhood, community, State Scenic Highway, or localized area. Such development may include installation of PV panels, electricity-generating systems, and construction of pedestrian and bicycle lanes. These developments would have the potential to substantially change the visual character and/or quality of an area.

However, future projects implementing the CAP and Significance Guidelines would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs listed below. They would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures that were previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. Environmental impacts associated with implementing the CAP and Significance

Guidelines would be reduced by the same mitigation required in the General Plan Program EIR.

The following are the General Plan policies as they relate to visual character and quality:

Policy LU-2.3: Development Densities and Lot Sizes. Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.

Policy LU-2.5: Greenbelts to Define Communities. Identify and maintain greenbelts between communities to reinforce the identity of individual communities.

Policy LU-4.1: Regional Planning. Participate in regional planning to ensure that the unique communities, assets, and challenges of the unincorporated lands are appropriately addressed with the implementation of the planning principles and land use requirements of SB [Senate Bill] 375.

Policy LU-4.2: Review of Impacts of Projects in Adjoining Jurisdictions. Review, comment on, and coordinate when appropriate on plans, projects, and proposals of overlapping or neighboring agencies to ensure compatibility with the County's General Plan, and ensure that adjacent communities are not adversely impacted.

Policy LU-4.3: Relationship of Plans in Adjoining Jurisdictions. Consider the plans and projects of overlapping or neighboring agencies in the planning of unincorporated lands, and invite comments and coordination when appropriate.

Policy LU-4.4: Development Compatibility with Military Facilities. Ensure compatibility of new development with the current and planned mission and operations of U.S. government military installations.

Policy LU-12.4: Planning for Compatibility. Plan and site infrastructure for public utilities and public facilities in a manner compatible with community character; minimize visual and environmental impacts; and, whenever feasible, locate any facilities and supporting infrastructure outside preserve areas. Require context sensitive Mobility Element road design that is compatible with community character and minimizes visual and environmental impacts.

Policy H-2.1: Development That Respects Community Character. Require that development in existing residential neighborhoods be well designed so as not to degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development consistent with the Land Use Element. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures include those listed above in Ia. and Ib. and as follows:

AES-3.1: Improve upon the County road standards or other right-of-way design guidelines to provide standards related to road design, parking, landscaping, and elements of the public realm that are critical to the character of a community.

AES-3.2: Implement existing and prepare new community right-of-way development standards, as appropriate, that supplement the County road standards in order to recognize the unique constraints and character of different communities.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances by which the project is undertaken and/or provide “new information of substantial importance” that could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Id. AESTHETICS (Light or Glare)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Dark skies are a natural resource in San Diego County, and are essential to the study of the celestial bodies. Astronomical research has contributed to a greater understanding of our solar system, supported advances in space travel, improved telecommunication systems and defense and surveillance systems, advanced weather forecasting and atmospheric physics, and provided insight into energy production. The maintenance of dark skies in San Diego County is vital to the two world-class observatories that depend on them for astronomical research: Palomar and Mount Laguna Observatories. Only a few high-quality astronomical research sites exist in the U.S. As two of the best, Palomar and Mount Laguna Observatories currently meet all of the criteria to be classified as premier astronomical sites.

Development associated with implementation of the CAP or Significance Guidelines would not result in major light sources. The CAP is a set of implementation measures related to reducing GHG emissions by encouraging increased efficiency in lighting. Distributed installation of PV panels on homes, businesses, and County facilities is encouraged to reduce the County’s dependence on energy sources that produce GHGs. PV panels are specifically designed to absorb, not reflect, sunlight. Thus, their placement and orientation on individual properties should have a beneficial impact by reducing overall lighting in the unincorporated County.

Future County projects implementing the CAP measures would comply with existing County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs as listed below. They would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures as analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. None of the types of projects that may implement CAP measures, such as building retrofits or pathways are expected to generate substantial light or glare.

The following are the General Plan policies as they relate to light or glare:

Policy COS-13.1: Restrict Light and Glare. Restrict outdoor light and glare from development projects in semi-rural and rural lands and designated rural communities to retain the quality of night skies by minimizing light pollution.

Policy COS-13.2: Palomar and Mount Laguna. Minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, the impact of development on the dark skies surrounding Palomar and Mount Laguna Observatories to maintain dark skies, which are vital to these two world-class observatories, by restricting exterior light sources within the impact areas of the observatories.

Policy COS-13.3: Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to retain the quality of night skies by minimizing light pollution.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Ila. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES (Direct Conversion of Agricultural Resources)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could convert San Diego County agricultural resources (including, but not limited to, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency), or other agricultural resources to non-agricultural use, or substantially impair the ongoing viability of important agricultural resources?

YES

☐

NO

☒

According to the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), agricultural and grazing land totals for the County are identified at 314,032 acres. However, due to the smaller farms located throughout the

County that do not fall within the mapping categories of the FMMP (10 acres), the County used a number of agricultural data sources to better estimate the acreage of agricultural resources. These sources identified approximately 407,600 acres of farmland within the County. Agricultural data sources used in this calculation were FMMP data, County Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) Geographic Information System (GIS) vegetation data, California Department of Water Resources land use data, Cleveland National Forest grazing allotments data, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Statistics Service data, and Agricultural Weights and Measures Commodities data.

Within this farmland, only 6% of the region's soils are considered Prime Agricultural Land, as defined in Government Code Section 51201 (Williamson Act). Soils in the San Diego region are generally considered poor. This is due to the County's generally steep terrain and erodible soils.

None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP or Significance Guidelines are expected to convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use. The CAP does recommend actions that would reduce GHG emissions from agricultural lands, such as nitrogen fertilizer reduction, fuel-efficient field equipment, and irrigation pump efficiency (CAP Measures A1, A2, and A3). These recommended actions would not reduce or convert farmland, but would, rather, increase efficiencies and reduce agricultural-related emissions. Future County projects implementing CAP measures would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs aimed at maintaining and protecting agricultural land and practices. These policies were previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR and are listed below.

Policy LU-6.4: Sustainable Subdivision Design. Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy LU-7.1: Agricultural Land Development. Protect agricultural lands with lower density land use designations that support continued agricultural operations.

Policy LU-7.2: Parcel Size Reduction as Incentive for Agriculture. Allow for reductions in lot size for compatible development when tracts of existing historically agricultural land are preserved in conservation easements for continued agricultural use.

Policy COS-6.4: Conservation Easements. Support the acquisition or voluntary dedication of agriculture conservation easements and programs that preserve agricultural lands.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could convert San Diego County agricultural resources or other agricultural resources or substantially impair the ongoing viability of important agricultural resources beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**IIb. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES (Land Use Conflicts)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could conflict with a Williamson Act Contract (contract) or the provisions of the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act), or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to IIa, above. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to have an impact on existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Recommended actions in the CAP specific to agriculture would reduce GHG emissions from agricultural lands with nitrogen fertilizer reduction, fuel-efficient field equipment, and irrigation pump efficiency. These recommended actions would not create agricultural zoning inconsistencies, but would, rather, increase efficiencies and reduce agricultural-related emissions. However, future County projects implementing these measures would comply with existing County zoning policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs that were analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR and are listed below and in IIa.

Policy COS-6.3: Compatibility with Recreation and Open Space. Encourage siting recreational and open space uses and multi-use trails that are compatible with agriculture adjacent to the agricultural lands when planning for development adjacent to agricultural land uses.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could cause conflict with a Williamson Act Contract, the provisions of the California Land Conservation Act, or agricultural zoning beyond that anticipated in the General Plan.

**IIc. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES (Indirect Conversion of Agriculture Resources)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of a San Diego County agricultural resource, to non-agricultural use?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to IIa, above. The CAP does recommend actions that would reduce GHG emissions from agricultural lands, such as nitrogen fertilizer reduction, use of fuel-efficient field equipment, and irrigation pump efficiency (CAP Measures A1, A2, and A3). These recommended actions would not cause the conversion of agricultural resources to other uses. For future County CAP projects, proposals would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs that were analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR and listed below, and in IIa, above, that are aimed at minimizing the potential for agricultural conversion.

Policy COS-6.2: Protection of Agricultural Operations. Protect existing agricultural operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses by doing the following:

- Limiting the ability of new development to take actions to limit existing agricultural uses by informing and educating new projects as to the potential impacts from agricultural operations.
- Encouraging new or expanded agricultural land uses to provide a buffer of non-intensive agriculture or other appropriate uses (e.g., landscape screening) between intensive uses and adjacent non-agricultural land uses.
- Allowing for agricultural uses in agricultural areas and designing development and lots in a manner that facilitates continued agricultural use within the development.
- Requiring development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture.
- Supporting local and state right-to-farm regulations.
- Retain or facilitate large and contiguous agricultural operations by consolidation of development during the subdivision process.

Policy COS-6.3: Compatibility with Recreation and Open Space. Encourage siting recreational and open space uses and multi-use trails that are compatible with adjacent agriculture.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could cause indirect conversion of agricultural resources to non-agricultural use beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

### **IIIa. Air Quality (Air Quality Plans)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP), and/or any local air quality plans?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The unincorporated portion of the County is located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The boundaries of the SDAB are contiguous with the political boundaries of San Diego County and encompass approximately 4,260 square miles. The County is divided by the Laguna Mountain Range, which runs generally parallel to the coast approximately 45 miles inland and separates the coastal area from the desert area. The Laguna Mountains have peaks reaching more than 6,000 feet, with the highest point in the County being Hot Springs Mountain, rising to 6,533 feet. The coastal region is made up of coastal terraces that rise from the ocean into wide mesas that then transition into the Laguna foothills farther to the east. From the foothills, the topography gradually rises to the rugged Laguna Mountain range. On the east side, the mountains drop off rapidly to the Anza-Borrego Desert, which is characterized by several broken mountain ranges with desert valleys in between. The Santa Ana Mountains are located north of the County along the coast of Orange County before turning east to join with the Laguna Mountains near the San Diego/Orange County border.

Implementation of CAP policies and Significance Guidelines for land use projects would likely contribute to implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Growth that occurs within the county is a result of people moving from another area, newly formed households, and new members of the workforce. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather



accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated deterioration of facilities or need for new facilities.

Implementation of CAP policies by future projects would not result in increase of criteria pollutant emissions compared to the existing use of the subject area that was anticipated by the RAQS. Therefore, the CAP would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP on a project or cumulative level. The purpose of the CAP is to reduce GHG emissions within the County to help contribute to global efforts to reduce the effects of climate change. Elements of the CAP include improving energy efficiency in buildings, improving energy management, reducing vehicle use, developing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, increasing use of renewable energy, and increasing water conservation. In addition to reducing GHGs, each of these elements would help to reduce criteria air pollutants. Further, climate change is expected to increase air quality issues, including increases in regional ambient concentrations of ozone, fine particles, and dust (CDC 2010); mitigating the impacts of climate change will help reduce the impacts expected to air quality.

The CAP proposes construction of distributed renewable energy technologies that would lead to short-term air quality impacts due to construction and operational activities. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs that require reduction measures to minimize construction and operational air quality emissions.

Future development would be required to demonstrate compliance with the strategies and measures adopted as part of the RAQS and SIP during the County's discretionary environmental review process, as well as with any applicable requirements of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD). Based on the requirements for consistency with emissions control strategies in the RAQS and SIP, implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the San Diego RAQS and/or applicable portions of the SIP.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS or applicable portions of the SIP and/or any local air quality plans beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

### **IIIb. Air Quality (Air Quality Violations)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could exceed the quantitative screening-level thresholds (SLTs) for attainment pollutants (NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and CO), exceed the SLTs for nonattainment pollutants (O<sub>3</sub> precursors and particulate matter), or result in:

- a. Emissions that exceed 250 pounds per day of NOX, or 75 pounds per day of VOCs;
- b. Emissions of CO that when totaled with the ambient concentrations will exceed a 1-hour concentration of 20 ppm or an 8-hour average of 9 ppm;
- c. Emissions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> that will exceed 55 pounds per day; or
- d. Emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> that exceed 100 pounds per day and increase the ambient PM<sub>10</sub> concentration by 5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> or greater at the maximum exposed individual?

YES

☐

NO

☒

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The County of San Diego Land Use Environment Group has established guidelines for determining significance that incorporate the San Diego APCD's established screening-level criteria for all new source review in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g., stationary and fugitive emissions, and emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROCs) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the SDAB) are used.

See response to IIIa, above. Implementation of CAP policies and Significance Guidelines in land use projects is likely to improve air quality parameters. The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated air quality impacts.

Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs. They would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR, as listed below. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to generate significant air pollution.

COS-14.1: Land Use Development Form. Require that development be located and designed to reduce vehicular trips (and associated air pollution) by utilizing compact regional and community-level development patterns while maintaining community character.

COS-14.2: Villages and Rural Villages. Incorporate a mixture of uses within Villages and Rural Villages that encourage people to walk, bicycle, or use public transit to reduce air pollution and GHG emissions.

COS-14.9: Significant Producers of Air Pollutants. Require projects that generate potentially significant levels of air pollutants and/or GHGs, such as quarries, landfill operations, or large land development projects, to incorporate renewable energy and the best available control technologies and practices into project design.

COS-14.10: Low-Emission Construction Vehicles and Equipment. Require County contractors and encourage other developers to use low-emission construction vehicles and equipment to improve air quality and reduce GHG emissions.

COS-15.1: Design and Construction of New Buildings. Require that new buildings be designed and constructed in accordance with “green building” programs that incorporate techniques and materials that maximize energy efficiency, incorporate the use of sustainable resources and recycled materials, and reduce emissions of GHGs and toxic air contaminants.

COS-15.3: Green Building Programs. Require all new County facilities and the renovation and expansion of existing County buildings to meet identified “green building” programs that demonstrate energy efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable technologies.

COS-15.4: Title 24 Energy Standards. Require development to minimize energy impacts from new buildings in accordance with or exceeding Title 24 energy standards.

COS-15.5: Energy Efficiency Audits. Encourage energy conservation and efficiency in existing development through energy efficiency audits and adoption of energy saving measures resulting from the audits.

COS-16.2: Single-Occupancy Vehicles. Support transportation management programs that reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles.

COS-16.3: Low-Emissions Vehicles and Equipment. Require County operations and encourage private development to provide incentives (such as priority parking) for the use of low- and zero-emission vehicles and equipment to improve air quality and reduce GHG emissions. [Refer also to Policy M-9.3 (Preferred Parking) in the Mobility Element.]

COS-20.3: Regional Collaboration. Coordinate air quality planning efforts with federal and state agencies, SANDAG, and other jurisdictions.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures:

Air-2.1 Provide incentives such as preferential parking for hybrids or alternatively fueled vehicles such as compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles or hydrogen- or electric-powered vehicles. The County shall also establish programs for priority or free parking on County streets or in County parking lots for hybrids or alternatively fueled vehicles.

Air-2.2 Replace existing vehicles in the County fleet as needed with the cleanest vehicles commercially available that are cost-effective and meet vehicle use needs.

Air-2.3 Implement transportation fleet fueling standards to improve the number of alternatively fueled vehicles in the County fleet.

Air-2.4 Provide incentives to promote the siting or use of clean air technologies where feasible. These technologies shall include, but not be limited to, fuel cell technologies, renewable energy sources, and hydrogen fuel.

Air-2.5 Require that the following measures be implemented on all construction projects where project emissions are above the SLTs:

- Multiple applications of water during grading between dozer/scrapper passes
- Paving, chip sealing or chemical stabilization of internal roadways after completion of grading
- Use of sweepers or water trucks to remove “track-out” at any point of public street access
- Termination of grading if winds exceed 25 miles per hour
- Stabilization of dirt storage piles by chemical binders, tarps, fencing or other erosion control
- Use of low-sulfur fuels in construction equipment
- Use of low-VOC paints
- Projects exceeding SLTs will require ten percent of the construction fleet to use any combination of diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters and/or CARB certified Tier I, II, III, IV equipment.

Air-2.6 Use County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality to identify and mitigate adverse environmental effects on air quality.

Air-2.7 Implement County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) regulations for air emissions from all sources under its jurisdiction.

Air-2.8 Require NSRs to prevent permitting projects that are “major sources.”

Air-2.9 Implement the Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance by requiring all clearing and grading to be conducted with dust control measures

Air-2.10 Revise Board Policy F-50 to strengthen the County's commitment and requirement to implement resource-efficient design and operations for County funded renovation and new building projects. This could be achieved by making the guidelines within the policy mandatory rather than voluntary.

Air-2.11 Implement County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) to attain State air quality standards for O<sub>3</sub>.

Air-2.12 Revise Board Policy G-15 to require County facilities to comply with Silver Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards or other equivalent Green Building rating systems.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

### **IIIC. Air Quality (Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the SDAB is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state Ambient Air Quality Standards (including emissions which exceed the SLTs for O<sub>3</sub> precursors)?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) and for particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when VOCs and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil), solvents, petroleum processing and storage, and pesticides. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> include motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

See response to IIIa, above. Implementation of CAP policies and Significance Guidelines for land use projects is likely to improve air quality parameters. The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program

EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated air quality impacts.

Future County projects implementing the CAP measures would comply with existing County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs. They would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. The policies identified, above, in response IIIb, would also apply to the non-attainment criteria pollutants. Development associated with implementation of the CAP would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the San Diego region is non-attainment (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP measures are expected to generate significant air pollution.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the SDAB is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state Ambient Air Quality Standards beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**IIId. Air Quality (Sensitive Receptors)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could directly impact a sensitive receptor and result in a cancer risk of greater than 1 in one million without implementation of Toxics Best Available Control Technology (T-BACT), 10 in one million with implementation of T-BACT, or health hazard index of one or more, consistent with the APCD’s Rule 1210 requirements for stationary sources.?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (preschool through 12th grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, daycare centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County also considers residences sensitive receptors, as they house children and older adults.

See response to IIIa, above. Implementation of CAP policies and Significance Guidelines for land use projects is likely to improve air quality parameters. The CAP is consistent

with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated or different air toxics impacts. Encouraging higher density projects could place sensitive receptors closer to sources of toxic emissions, but compliance with the mitigation measure listed below would mitigate any potential impacts.

Future County projects implementing the CAP measures would comply with existing County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs. They would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP measures are expected to generate significant air toxics emissions.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measure specific to sensitive receptors:

Air-4.1: Use the policies set forth in the CARB's Land Use and Air Quality Handbook (CARB 2005) as a guideline for siting sensitive land uses. Implementation of this measure will ensure that sensitive land uses such as residences, schools, day care centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities are sited appropriately to minimize exposure to emissions of toxic air contaminants.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could directly impact sensitive receptors beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

### **IIIe. Air Quality (Objectionable Odors)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could result in the emission of any material which causes nuisance to a considerable number of persons or endangers the comfort, health or safety of any person. A project that proposes a use which would produce objectionable odors would be deemed to have an odor impact if it would affect a considerable number of off-site receptors?

YES

☐

NO

☒

There are seven active landfills in the San Diego region that serve residents, businesses, and military operations of incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County. The landfills located in the unincorporated County with the potential to impact

unincorporated County residents are the Borrego Landfill and Ramona Landfill. Odor control practices are in place at all landfills, and odor control is under the purview of the APCD.

Major agricultural areas are located in the Bonsall CPA, Fallbrook CPA, Jamul/Dulzura CPA, Lakeside CPA, Mountain Empire Subregion, North County Metro Subregion, North Mountain Subregion, Pala/Pauma Valley Subregion, Pendleton/De Luz CPA, Rainbow CPA, Ramona CPA, and Valley Center CPA.

Areas were identified in the General Plan Program EIR that would accommodate industrial operations that may include these types of facilities or other odor-generating industrial processes: Alpine CPA, Fallbrook CPA, Jamul/Dulzura CPA, Lakeside CPA, Mountain Empire Subregion, North County Metro Subregion, Pala/Pauma Valley Subregion, Pendleton/De Luz CPA, Ramona CPA, San Dieguito CPA, Spring Valley CPA, and Valle de Oro CPA. Industrial facilities, especially those located in the CPAs proposed for higher density development such as Fallbrook CPA, Lakeside CPA, Spring Valley CPA, and Valle de Oro CPA, may be located near residential developments that would be sensitive to odors. For example, limited impact industrial land uses would be accommodated in an area surrounded by land proposed for village residential use along the western edge of the Fallbrook CPA. However, as described in the General Plan Program EIR, regulations are currently in place that would prohibit land uses such as agricultural operations and industrial facilities from emitting nuisance odors in the unincorporated County.

Other odor sources are present within the County, including wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, and chemical plants.

Odor sources are present within the County, including agricultural operations and landfills; however, the CAP and Significance Guidelines are consistent with the County odor policies enforced by the APCD, including Rule 51 and County Code Sections 63.401 and 63.402, which prohibit nuisance odors and identify enforcement measures to reduce odor impacts to nearby receptors.

Future County projects implementing the CAP are not likely to create objectionable odors. The Draft CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated or additional impacts. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP measures are expected to generate significant objectionable odor.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new



information of substantial importance” that could create nuisance to a considerable number of persons or endangers the comfort, health or safety of any person or have an odor impact on a considerable number of off-site receptors beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**IVa. Biological Resources (Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The unincorporated County is home to a diverse range of species, which can be attributed to the variety of vegetation and habitats associated with the region’s range of micro-climates, topography, soils, and other natural features. The unincorporated lands comprise the largest geographical area within the County boundary, with natural features that include lagoons, foothills, mountain ranges, and deserts. The physical and climatic conditions found in the unincorporated County provide for a wide variety of habitats and biological communities. The County is home to a large number of rare, threatened, endangered, or otherwise sensitive species.

The CAP encourages the addition of facilities such as electricity-generating systems and construction of pedestrian and bicycle lanes, which could potentially impact special-status species and their habitats through facility construction and operation. Existing County policies and regulations, General Plan goals and policies, and mitigation measures identified and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR are intended to protect biological resources. Specific measures that implement these policies and regulations are proposed to ensure that the intended protections are achieved. The General Plan Program EIR policies and mitigation measures identified would mitigate impacts to special-status species and their habitats. Any facilities constructed as a result of implementation of the CAP or Significance Guidelines would require the same mitigation measures as listed in the General Plan Program EIR. The projects would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures from the General Plan Program EIR listed below.

Policy COS-1.3: Management. Monitor, manage, and maintain the regional preserve system, facilitating the survival of native species and the preservation of healthy populations of rare, threatened, or endangered species.

Policy COS-1.8: Preserve Assemblage. Support the acquisition of large tracts of land that have multiple resource preservation benefits, such as biology, hydrology, cultural, aesthetics, and community character. Establish funding mechanisms to serve as an alternative when mitigation requirements would not result in the acquisition of large tracts of land.

Policy COS-1.9: Invasive Species. Require new development adjacent to biological preserves to use non-invasive plants in landscaping. Encourage the removal of invasive plants within preserves.

Policy COS-1.10: Public Involvement. Ensure an open, transparent, and inclusive decision-making process by involving the public throughout the course of planning and implementation of habitat conservation plans and resource management plans.

Policy COS-2.1: Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement. Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands, where appropriate.

Policy COS-2.2: Habitat Protection through Site Design. Require development to be sited in the least biologically sensitive areas, and minimize the loss of natural habitat through site design.

Policy LU-6.1: Environmental Sustainability. Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.

Policy LU-6.2: Reducing Development Pressures. Assign lowest density or lowest intensity land use designations to areas with sensitive natural resources.

Policy LU-6.3: Conservation-Oriented Project Design. Support conservation-oriented project design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy LU-6.4: Sustainable Subdivision Design. Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when

appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy LU-6.6: Integration of Natural Features into Project Design. Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development, and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.

Policy LU-6.7: Open Space Network. Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors, preserve scenic vistas and areas, and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.

Policy LU-10.2: Development – Environmental Resource Relationship. Require development in Semi-Rural and Rural areas to respect and conserve the unique natural features and rural character, and avoid sensitive or intact environmental resources and hazard areas.

#### General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures

Bio-1.2: Implement and revise existing habitat conservation plans/policies to preserve sensitive resources within a cohesive system of open space. In addition, continue preparation of MSCP Plans for North County and East County.

Bio-1.3: Implement conservation agreements through Board Policy I-123, as this will facilitate preservation of high-value habitat in the County's MSCP Subarea Plan.

Bio-1.4: Coordinate with nonprofit groups and other agencies to acquire preserve lands.

Bio-1.5: Utilize County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources to identify adverse impacts to biological resources. Also use the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and the Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species to locate special-status species populations on or near project sites. This information will be used to avoid or mitigate impacts as appropriate.

Bio-1.6: Implement the RPO, BMO, and HLP [Habitat Loss Permit] Ordinance to protect wetlands, wetland buffers, sensitive habitat lands, biological resource core areas, linkages, corridors, high-value habitat areas, subregional coastal sage scrub focus areas, and populations of rare or endangered plant or animal species.

Bio-1.7: Minimize edge effects from development projects located near sensitive resources by implementing the County Noise Ordinance; the County

Groundwater Ordinance; the County's Landscaping Regulations (currently part of the Zoning Ordinance); and the County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could adversely impact any special-status species beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**IVb. Biological Resources (Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to IVa, above. Future development implementing the CAP or Significance Guidelines, such as alternative energy-generation facilities or pedestrian paths, could have potentially significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities; however, these projects would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures from the General Plan Program EIR. Existing County policies and regulations, General Plan goals and policies, and mitigation measures identified and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR are intended to protect biological resources. Specific measures that implement these policies and regulations are proposed to ensure that the intended protections are achieved. The General Plan Program EIR policies and mitigation measures identified would mitigate impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Any facilities constructed as a result of implementation of the CAP or Significance Guidelines would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures from the General Plan Program EIR, listed below. In addition to the following policies, the policies listed under Section IVa would also apply to sensitive natural communities.

COS-3.1: Wetland Protection. Require development to preserve existing natural wetland areas and associated transitional riparian and upland buffers and retain opportunities for enhancement.

In addition to the following mitigation measures from the General Plan Program EIR, the measures listed under Section IVa apply:

Bio-2.1 Revise the ordinance relating to water conservation for landscaping to incorporate appropriate plant types and regulations requiring planting of native or compatible nonnative, non-invasive plant species in new development.

Bio-2.2 Require that development projects obtain CWA [Clean Water Act] Section 401/404 permits issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for all project-related disturbances of waters of the U.S. and/or associated wetlands. Also continue to require that projects obtain Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreements from the California Department of Fish and Game for all project-related disturbances of streambeds.

Bio-2.3 Ensure that wetlands and wetland buffer areas are adequately preserved whenever feasible to maintain biological functions and values.

Bio-2.4 Implement the Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance to protect wetlands.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could adversely impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**IVc. Biological Resources (Federally Protected Wetlands)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to IVa, above. The CAP encourages development of facilities such as electricity-generating systems and construction of pedestrian and bicycle lanes, which could potentially impact federally protected wetlands through facility construction and operation. However, existing County policies; the General Plan Program EIR policies (listed below) and mitigation measures Bio-1.1, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, Bio-2.2, Bio-2.3, and Bio-2.4, described above in Sections IVa and IVb, would apply to federally protected wetlands. Any project constructed as a result of implementation of the CAP or Significance Guidelines would be subject to the applicable policies and require the same mitigation measures as listed and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR.

Policy COS-3.1: Wetland Protection. Require development to preserve existing natural wetland areas and associated transitional riparian and upland buffers and retain opportunities for enhancement.

Policy COS-3.2: Minimize Impacts of Development. Require development projects to:

- Mitigate any unavoidable losses of wetlands, including its habitat functions and values; and
- Protect wetlands, including vernal pools, from a variety of discharges and activities, such as dredging or adding fill material, exposure to pollutants such as nutrients, hydromodification, land and vegetation clearing, and the introduction of invasive species.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could adversely impact federally protected wetlands beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **IVd. Biological Resources (Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to IVa, above. The CAP encourages the development of facilities such as electricity-generating systems and construction of pedestrian and bicycle lanes, which could potentially impact wildlife movement or wildlife corridors through facility construction and operation. However, existing County policies; the General Plan Program EIR policies (listed below) and mitigation measures Bio-1.1, Bio-1.2, Bio-1.2, Bio-1.4, Bio-1.5, Bio-1.6, Bio-1.7, and Bio-2.3, described above in Section IVa and IVb, would apply to wildlife corridors and the maintenance of wildlife movement capacity. Any project constructed as a result of implementation of the CAP or Significance Guidelines would be subject to the applicable policies and require the same mitigation measures as listed and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR.

Policy COS-1.1: Coordinated Preserve System. Identify and develop a coordinated biological preserve system that includes Pre Approved Mitigation

Areas, Biological Resource Core Areas, wildlife corridors, and linkages to allow wildlife to travel throughout their habitat ranges.

Policy COS-1.2: Minimize Impacts. Prohibit private development within established preserves. Minimize impacts within established preserves when the construction of public infrastructure is unavoidable.

Policy LU-6.1: Environmental Sustainability. Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.

Policy LU-6.7: Open Space Network. Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors, preserve scenic vistas and areas, and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **IVe. Biological Resources (Local Policies and Ordinances)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could conflict with local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The CAP does encourage the addition of facilities such as electricity-generating systems, and construction of pedestrian and bicycle lanes, which would potentially impact special-status species and their habitats. Future projects implementing the CAP would be required to comply with applicable policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could conflict with local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **IVf. Biological Resources (Habitat Conservation Plans and NCCPs)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

Future projects implementing the CAP and Significance Guidelines are not anticipated to be of the nature or magnitude to conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP); Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP). The CAP does encourage the addition of facilities such as electricity-generating systems, and construction of pedestrian and bicycle lanes, which would potentially impact special-status species and their habitats. Future projects constructed as a result of the CAP would be required to comply with applicable HCPs, NCCPs, and any other applicable habitat conservation plan. Regulatory processes to ensure compliance are already in place and would not be impacted by the CAP.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **Va. Cultural Resources (Historical Resources)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines or the County’s RPO through physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Unincorporated San Diego County contains historical sites that are designated on local, state, and national historical lists and meet the definitions of historical resources under Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines or the County’s RPO. These resources include historical residences, school houses, stage depots, and cemeteries throughout the County. However, historical resources tend to be concentrated in the more developed areas of the County, such as Spring Valley and San Dieguito, and in areas with established town centers, such as Ramona, Julian, and Fallbrook. Historical resources are also generally located along major roadways in the County, such as I-8 and SR-78. In addition, some resources existing within the unincorporated County are eligible to be historically significant but have not yet been designated.



The CAP does not propose any strategy or measure that would directly result in an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. However, the CAP does recommend retrofitting and renovating older buildings to be more energy efficient and, thus, reduce GHGs associated with energy consumption. The CAP also proposes construction of other resources such as bike and pedestrian paths. It is unlikely that these measures would be applied to a historic resource. However, to the extent that the measures are applied to a historical resource, existing County policies and regulations, General Plan goals and policies, and mitigation measures identified and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR (listed below) are intended to protect historical resources, and specific measures that implement these policies and regulations are proposed to ensure that the intended protections are achieved. Therefore, any construction or retrofitting of historical resources as a result of the CAP or associated guidelines would be subject to specific implementation programs.

Policy COS-8.1: Preservation and Adaptive Reuse. Encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes as a means of protecting important historic resources.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to historic resources:

Cul-1.1 Utilize the RPO, CEQA, the Grading and Clearing Ordinance, and the Zoning Ordinance to identify and protect important historic and archaeological resources by requiring appropriate reviews and applying mitigation when impacts are significant.

Cul-1.2 Provide incentives through the Mills Act to encourage the restoration, renovation, or adaptive reuse of historic resources.

Cul-1.3 Initiate a new effort to identify and catalog historic and potentially historic resources within unincorporated San Diego County. This process will require public participation and evaluation by County staff and the Historic Site Board. The anticipated result of this effort is (1) at minimum, landowners will be better informed of potential resources on their properties, as well as the options available to them under the [California Register of Historic Resources]/National Register [of Historic Places] or the Mills Act; and (2) in some cases, properties may be zoned with a special area designator for historic resources, thereby restricting demolition/removal and requiring a site plan permit for proposed construction, which will be reviewed by the Historic Site Board.

Cul-1.4 Support the Historic Site Board in their efforts to provide oversight for historic resources.

Cul-1.5 Ensure landmarking and historical listing of County-owned historic sites.

Cul-1.6 Implement and update, as necessary, the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources to identify and minimize adverse impacts to historic and archaeological resources.

Cul-1.7 Identify potentially historic structures within the County and enter the information into the Department of Planning and Land Use property database. Identification will occur by compiling information from all available sources (e.g., County surveys, Historic Site Board, information received from SOHO [Save Our Heritage Organization] and community planning groups, information from other jurisdictions), and shall be updated at least every 5 years.

Cul-1.8 Revise the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) to apply to the demolition or alteration of identified significant historic structures.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vb. Cultural Resources (Archaeological Resources)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined by PRC Section 21083.2, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). This shall include the destruction or disturbance of an important archaeological site or any portion of an important archaeological site that contains or has the potential to contain information important to history or prehistory?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to Va., above. The CAP does not propose any strategy or measure that would directly result in an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. The CAP proposes construction of resources such as bike and pedestrian paths. Ground-disturbing development associated with implementation of the CAP would have the potential to create a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. However, existing County policies and regulations, General Plan goals and policies, and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Program EIR (listed below) are intended to protect archeological resources, and specific measures that implement these policies and regulations are proposed to ensure that the intended protections are achieved. Therefore, future projects implementing the CAP measures or Significance Guidelines would be subject to specific implementation

programs. County policies that were previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR are listed below.

Policy COS-7.1: Archaeological Protection. Preserve important archaeological resources from loss or destruction and require development to include appropriate mitigation to protect the quality and integrity of these resources.

Policy COS-7.2: Open Space Easements. Require development to avoid archaeological resources whenever possible. If complete avoidance is not possible, require development to fully mitigate impacts to archaeological resources.

Policy COS-7.3: Archaeological Collections. Require the appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections in a culturally appropriate manner.

Policy COS-7.4: Consultation with Affected Communities. Require consultation with affected communities, including local tribes, to determine the appropriate treatment of cultural resources.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to archaeological resources:

In addition to the following mitigation measures, measures Cul-1.1 and Cul-1.6, identified above, would also apply to archaeological resources.

Cul-2.1 Develop management and restoration plans for identified and acquired properties with cultural resources.

Cul-2.2 Facilitate the identification and acquisition of important resources through collaboration with agencies, tribes, and institutions, such as the South Coast Information Center (SCIC), while maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive cultural information.

Cul-2.3 Support the dedication of easements that protect important cultural resources by using a variety of funding methods, such as grant or matching funds, or funds from private organizations.

Cul-2.4 Protect significant cultural resources through regional coordination and consultation with the NAHC [Native American Heritage Commission] and local tribal governments, including SB 18 review.

Cul-2.5 Protect undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources by requiring grading monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor for all ground-disturbing activities, and also, when feasible, during initial surveys.

Cul-2.6 Protect significant cultural resources by facilitating the identification and acquisition of important resources through regional coordination with agencies

and institutions, such as the South Coast Information Center (SCIC), and consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local tribal governments, including SB 18 review, while maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive cultural information.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could cause substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vc. Cultural Resources (Paleontological Resources)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to Va., above. Future projects implementing the CAP and Significance Guidelines would have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site; however, the General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR, and listed below, would mitigate potentially significant impacts to a special unique paleontological resource or site. Therefore, any construction as a result of the CAP or Significance Guidelines would be subject to specific implementation programs.

Policy COS-9.1: Preservation. Require the salvage and preservation of unique paleontological resources when exposed to the elements during excavation or grading activities or other development processes.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to paleontological resources:

Cul-3.1 Implement the Grading Ordinance and CEQA to minimize impacts to paleontological resources, require a paleontological resources monitor during grading when appropriate, and apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.

Cul-3.2 Implement and update, as necessary, the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance for Paleontological Resources to identify and minimize adverse impacts to paleontological resources.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new

information of substantial importance” that could destroy a unique paleontological resource beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vd. Cultural Resources (Human Remains)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could disturb any human remains, Native American or otherwise, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to Va., above. Future projects implementing the CAP and Significance Guidelines would have the potential to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. However, adherence to required regulations and the policies and mitigation measures identified and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR, as listed below, would minimize impacts to human remains, if encountered.

Policy COS-7.5: Treatment of Human Remains. Require human remains be treated with the utmost dignity and respect and that the disposition and handling of human remains will be done in consultation with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) and under the requirements of federal, state, and County regulations.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to disturbance of human remains:

In addition to the following mitigation measure, measures Cul-1.1 and Cul-1.6, identified above, would also apply to human remains.

Cul-4.1 Include regulations and procedures for discovery of human remains in all land disturbance and archaeological-related programs. Ensure that all references to discovery of human remains promote preservation and include proper handling and coordination with Native American groups. Apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could disturb any human remains beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vla. Geology and Soils (Exposure to Seismic-Related Hazards)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault as delineated on the most recent AP Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or landslides?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Numerous faults have been mapped in San Diego County. Each fault is classified based on its most recent movement, as indicated below:

- Historic (movement within the last 200 years)
- Holocene (movement within the past 11,000 years)
- Late-Quaternary (movement within the past 700,000 years)
- Quaternary (age undifferentiated within the past 1.6 million years)
- Pre-Quaternary (movement older than 1.6 million years)

The General Plan Program EIR identifies several major active faults and fault zones that are present within San Diego County: the San Jacinto Fault Zone, including Coyote Creek Fault; the Elsinore Fault Zone and nearby Earthquake Valley Fault; and the Rose Canyon Fault Zone, including a series of unnamed faults trending from downtown San Diego across San Diego Bay to the City of Coronado. The San Andreas Fault Zone is not located within San Diego County, but it is a major fault zone and has a length of roughly 900 miles in California. A portion of the fault zone traverses through Imperial County, adjacent to San Diego County.

While the County of San Diego will be subject to future earthquake shaking, the CAP and Significance Guidelines are intended to reduce community-wide GHGs with implementation measures, none of which would directly affect the potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects resulting from rupture of an earthquake fault.

Future projects implementing the CAP may include the development of an expanded network of bike and pedestrian facilities, possible new facilities, and retrofitting existing residential and commercial structures to be more energy efficient, thus reducing GHG emissions associated with energy consumption. As identified in the General Plan Program EIR, any future development would be required to comply with all relevant federal, state, and local regulations and building standards, including the California Building Code (CBC) and the County’s required geotechnical reconnaissance reports and investigations. Future County projects implementing the CAP and Significance Guidelines would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General

Plan policies and programs, specifically those found in the Safety Element. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP would be expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving earthquakes.

To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, any new development must conform to the Seismic Requirements that are outlined within the CBC. The County building permit process requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. These requirements reduce potential for hazards due to strong-seismic ground shaking.

Future project implementing the CAP, such as expanded network of bike and pedestrian facilities or possible new facilities would have the potential to result in hazards associated with on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Compliance with regulations as described above and identified in the General Plan Program EIR would reduce impacts associated with on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic ground failure, including liquefaction or landslides.

Additionally, the CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, risk associated with implementation of CAP policies would not increase in relation to ground failure.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving fault rupture, seismic-related ground shaking or ground failure beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vlb. Geology and Soils (Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Components of the CAP include the development of an expanded network of bike and pedestrian facilities, possible new facilities, and retrofitting existing residential and commercial structures to be more energy efficient and, thus, reduce GHG emissions associated with energy consumption. Construction of these components would have the potential to create substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; however, future development would be required to comply with the policies and mitigation measures identified and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR.

As described and analyzed in Sections 2.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, and 2.9, Land Use General Plan Program of the General Plan Program EIR, adherence to applicable regulations, including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), CBC, and the County Grading Ordinance, would reduce impacts associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to result in substantial adverse effects involving soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vlc. Geology and Soils (Soil Stability)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in effects related to a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See responses to Vlc. and d., above. Future County CAP projects would comply with existing County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs, specifically those outlined in the Safety Element. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic ground failure, including liquefaction. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving unstable geologic conditions, including on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.



**VId. Geology and Soils (Expansive Soils)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in effects related to expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802A.3.2 of the CBC, creating substantial risks to life or property?

YES

☐

NO

☒

CAP projects include the development of an expanded network of bike and pedestrian facilities, possible new facilities, and retrofitting existing residential and commercial structures to be more energy efficient. Thus, components of the CAP would have the potential to be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, as identified in the General Plan Program EIR, projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including the International Building Code (IBC) and CBC.

Implementation of CAP policies and the Significance Guidelines for land use projects is not likely to affect soil parameters. The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, risk associated with implementation of CAP policies would not increase in relation to expansive soils.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving expansive soils beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vle. Geology and Soils (Waste Water Disposal Systems)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in effects related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Implementation of CAP policies and the Significance Guidelines for land use projects is not expected to impact the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not increase risk of failure of septic systems. Additionally, the General Plan Program EIR recognizes that all future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to septic tanks and waste water disposal, including County Department of Environmental Health standards. Compliance with such regulations would reduce the potential for septic systems to be located in soils incapable of supporting such systems.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in effects related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vlf. Geology and Soils (Unique Geologic Features)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

YES

☐

NO

☒

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes that also generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the unincorporated County.

See response to Va., above. Development implementing the CAP would have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature; however, as stated in the General Plan Program EIR, any future development would be required to follow regulations, including completion of a County-required geological reconnaissance report. The following General Plan policy, previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR, requires the protection of unique geologic features.

COS-9.2 Require development to minimize impacts to unique geological features from human-related destruction, damage, or loss.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could destroy a unique geologic feature beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIa. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Future County projects implementing the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not result in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. It is possible that construction activities associated with residential and commercial retrofit and renovation projects would require temporary use of construction materials, such as paints and solvents, but not in large enough quantities to cause adverse effects. In addition, impacts associated with hazardous materials transport have been evaluated in Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the General Plan Program EIR as less than significant due to adherence with applicable regulations. To the extent that the CAP would result in projects transporting hazardous materials, it would not be routine, and those projects would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous materials. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIIb. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See discussion under VIIa. Future County projects implementing the CAP would not result in conditions that would increase potential release of hazardous materials. It is possible that construction activities associated with residential and commercial retrofit may require the use of typical hazardous materials but not in a manner that could increase potential for accidental release. In addition, impacts associated with hazardous materials transport have been evaluated in Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the General Plan Program EIR as less than significant due to adherence with applicable regulations. To the extent that the CAP would result in projects utilizing hazardous materials, it would not be routine, and those projects would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to proper storage and handling of hazardous materials.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIc. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Hazards to Schools)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to VIIa and VIIb. Future CAP projects would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to expose the population to hazardous waste. Additionally, required compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes would ensure that risks associated with hazardous emissions are minimized. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIId. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Existing Hazardous Materials Sites)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in effects related to a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

YES

☐

NO

☒

CAP policies in processing of land use projects would not increase risk of exposure to hazardous materials. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to increase risk of exposure to hazardous materials. Additionally, the CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, risk associated with implementation of CAP policies would not increase in relation to hazardous material sites.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in effects related to a hazardous material site beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIe. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Public Airports)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would locate development within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

YES

☐

NO

☒

CAP policies and projects would not increase risk of exposure to hazards related to airports. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing

County policies and regulations and with the General Plan policies and programs. While the CAP does not encourage any project near an airport or airport land use plan, renovation or retrofit projects, pathways, and other projects implementing the CAP projects that have site-specific concerns may be located within an airport influence area. These projects would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR (listed below), particularly compliance with the County of San Diego Airport Land Use Commission's adopted *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan*.

Policy LU-4.7: Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans. Coordinate with the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and support review of Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) for development within Airport Influence Areas.

Policy S-15.1: Land Use Compatibility. Require land uses surrounding airports to be compatible with the operation of each airport.

Policy S-15.3: Hazardous Obstructions within Airport Approach and Departure. Restrict development of potentially hazardous obstructions or other hazards to flight located within airport approach and departure areas or known flight patterns, and discourage uses that may impact airport operations or do not meet federal or state aviation standards. Specific concerns include heights of structures near airports and activities which can cause electronic or visual impairments to air navigation or which attract large numbers of birds (such as landfills, wetlands, water features, and cereal grain fields).

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to airport hazards:

Haz-1.1 Implement the Guidelines for Determining Significance, Airport Hazards, when reviewing new development projects to ensure compatibility with surrounding airports and land uses, and apply appropriate mitigation when impacts are significant.

Haz-1.2 Participate in the development of ALUCPs and future revisions to the ALUCPs to ensure the compatibility of land uses and airport operations.

Haz-1.3 Review the AICUZ [Air Installation Compatible Use Zone] when reviewing new development projects within the study area. Ensure that such development projects are consistent with the land use compatibility and safety policies therein.

Haz-1.4 Facilitate coordination between DPW [County Department of Public Works] and DPLU staff when planning new airports or operational changes to existing airports when those changes would produce new or modified airport hazard zones.

Haz-1.5 Coordinate with the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) and County airports for issues related to airport planning and operations.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in a safety hazard for a project within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport for people residing or working in the project area beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Vllf. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Private Airports)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would locate development within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to Vlle above. CAP policies for land use projects would not increase risk of exposure to hazards related to airports. Future County projects implementing the CAP projects would comply with existing County policies and regulations and with the General Plan policies and programs previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. Renovation or retrofit projects, pathways, and other CAP projects that have site-specific concerns may be located near a private airstrip. These projects would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures included and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. Development associated with implementation of the CAP would have less-than-significant impacts with implementation of the mitigation measures mentioned below within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

In addition to the following policy, the policies listed above in Vlle would also apply to private airports hazards.

Policy S-15.4: Private Airstrip and Heliport Location. Locate private airstrips and heliports outside of safety zones and flight paths for existing airports where they are compatible with surrounding established and planned land uses, and in a manner to avoid impacting public roadways and facilities.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in a safety hazard for a project

within the vicinity of a private airstrip for people residing or working in the project area beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIg. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. Operational Area Emergency Plan and Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

The CAP recommends strategies and projects that would reduce GHG emissions. The implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not physically interfere with the County's Operational Area Emergency Plan or Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

ii. San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan

The CAP recommends strategies and projects intended to reduce GHG emissions. The implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not physically interfere with the San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan because the 10-mile response zone would not be affected.

iii. Oil Spill Contingency Element

The CAP recommends strategies and projects intended to reduce GHG emissions. The implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not physically interfere with the County's Oil Spill Contingency Element, because the immediate coastline would not be affected.

iv. Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan

The CAP implements strategies and projects intended to reduce GHG emissions. The types of improvements that could implement the CAP measures would not be likely to physically interfere with the County's Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and



Energy Shortage Response Plan because these actions would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. Dam Evacuation Plan

The CAP implements strategies and projects intended to reduce GHG emissions. The implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not physically interfere with the County's Dam Evacuation Plan because these actions would not place projects within dam inundation zones or where it would be difficult to safely evacuate in the event of a dam failure.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIh. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Wildland Fires)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The CAP implements strategies and projects intended to reduce GHG emissions. The types of improvements that could implement the CAP measures are likely to be in high or very high fire hazard severity zones. However, these improvements would not be likely to increase fire risk or place new people or structures in areas susceptible to the threat of wildland fire.

Development associated with implementation of the CAP would be required to comply with the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR policies and mitigation measures. Compliance with applicable regulations and existing building codes requiring the maintenance of fire-safe clearance areas around existing homes and businesses would also be necessary for any CAP-related development. Future County projects implementing the CAP would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures that were previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR, listed below:

Policy LU-6.11: Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards. Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high, and high hazard fire areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.

Policy LU-11.2: Compatibility with Community Character. Require that commercial, office, and industrial development be located, scaled, and designed to be compatible with the unique character of the community.

Policy S-3.1: Defensible Development. Require development to be located, designed, and constructed to provide adequate defensibility and minimize the risk of structural loss and life safety resulting from wildland fires.

Policy S-3.2: Development in Hillsides and Canyons. Require development located near ridgelines, top of slopes, saddles, or other areas where the terrain or topography affect its susceptibility to wildfires to be located and designed to account for topography and reduce the increased risk from fires.

Policy S-3.3: Minimize Flammable Vegetation. Site and design development to minimize the likelihood of a wildfire spreading to structures by minimizing pockets, peninsulas, or islands of flammable vegetation within a development.

Policy S-3.4: Service Availability. Plan for development where fire and emergency services are available or planned.

Policy S-3.6: Fire Protection Measures. Ensure that development located within fire threat areas implement measures that reduce the risk of structural and human loss due to wildfire.

Policy S-4.1: Fuel Management Programs. Support programs consistent with state law that require fuel management/modification within established defensible space boundaries; when strategic fuel modification is necessary outside of defensible space, balance fuel management needs to protect structures with the preservation of native vegetation and sensitive habitats.

Policy COS-18.3: Alternative Energy Systems Impacts. Require alternative energy system operators to properly design and maintain these systems to minimize adverse impacts to the environment.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to wildland fires:

Haz-4.3 Enforce and comply with building and fire codes to ensure there are adequate fire service levels, and require site and/or building designs that incorporate features that reduce fire hazards. Also implement the General Plan Regional Category Map and Land Use Maps, which typically show lower densities in wildland areas.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would expose people or structures to a

significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

### **VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Vectors)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would substantially increase human exposure to vectors capable of spreading disease by:

- a. Proposing a vector breeding source including, but not limited to, sources of standing water for more than 72 hours (e.g., ponds, stormwater management facilities, constructed wetlands); or
- b. Proposing a vector breeding source including, but not limited to, composting or manure management facilities, confined animal facilities, or animal boarding/breeding/training?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Components of the CAP include the development of an expanded network of bike and pedestrian facilities, possible new facilities, and retrofitting existing residential and commercial structures to be more energy efficient and thus reduce GHG emissions associated with energy consumption. These projects would be required to comply with existing regulations, policies, plans, and guidelines associated with vector control (including mosquitoes, rats, and flies) to ensure that significant impacts do not occur. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving vectors. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would substantially increase human exposure to vectors capable of spreading disease beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

### **VIIIa. Hydrology and Water Quality (Water Quality Standards and Requirements)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would violate any water quality standards, otherwise degrade water quality, or violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

YES

☐

NO

☒

The CAP encourages energy efficiency renovations within existing residential and commercial structures and other construction-related activities related to new facilities. Construction associated with these projects could increase erosion and adversely affect

urban runoff. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs. They would be subject to the previously analyzed design features and mitigation measures of the General Plan Program EIR, listed below:

Policy LU-6.5: Sustainable Stormwater Management. Ensure that development minimizes the use of impervious surfaces and incorporates other Low Impact Development (LID) techniques, as well as a combination of site design, source control, and stormwater best management practices, where applicable and consistent with the County's LID Handbook.

Policy LU-6.9: Development Conformance with Topography. Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading, incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site, and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

Policy COS-4.2: Drought-Efficient Landscaping. Require efficient irrigation systems and, in new development, encourage the use of native plant species and non-invasive drought-tolerant/low-water-use plants in landscaping.

Policy COS-4.3: Stormwater Filtration. Maximize stormwater filtration and/or infiltration in areas that are not subject to high groundwater by maximizing the natural drainage patterns and the retention of natural vegetation and other pervious surfaces. This policy shall not apply in areas with high groundwater, where raising the water table could cause septic system failures, moisture damage to building slabs, and/or other problems.

Policy COS-5.2: Impervious Surfaces. Require development to minimize the use of directly connected impervious surfaces and to retain stormwater run-off caused from the development footprint at or near the site of generation.

Policy COS-5.3: Downslope Protection. Require development to be appropriately sited and to incorporate measures to retain natural flow regimes, thereby protecting downslope areas from erosion, capturing runoff to adequately allow for filtration and/or infiltration, and protecting downstream biological resources.

Policy COS-5.5: Impacts of Development to Water Quality. Require development projects to avoid impacts to the water quality in local reservoirs; groundwater resources; and recharge areas, watersheds, and other local water sources.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to water quality standards:

Hyd-1.2 Implement and revise as necessary the Watershed Protection Ordinance to reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters and to encourage the removal of invasive species and restore natural drainage systems.

Hyd-1.3 Establish and implement LID standards for new development to minimize runoff and maximize infiltration.

Hyd-1.5 Utilize the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Surface Water Quality, Hydrology, and Groundwater Resources to identify adverse environmental effects.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would violate any water quality standards, otherwise degrade water quality, or violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIIb. Hydrology and Water Quality (Groundwater Supplies and Recharge)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Development associated with implementation of the CAP, such as a pedestrian or bike pathway, an electricity-generating facility, or retrofitting an existing building are generally not the types of projects that would interfere with groundwater supplies, and so would not create the potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs. They would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures as analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR, listed below.

Policy LU-8.1: Density Relationship to Groundwater Sustainability. Require land use densities in groundwater-dependent areas to be consistent with the long-term sustainability of groundwater supplies, except in the Borrego Valley.

Policy LU-8.2: Groundwater Resources. Require development to identify adequate groundwater resources in groundwater dependent areas, as follows:

- In areas dependent on currently identified groundwater overdrafted basins, prohibit new development from exacerbating overdraft conditions. Encourage programs to alleviate overdraft conditions in Borrego Valley.

- In areas without current overdraft groundwater conditions, evaluate new groundwater-dependent development to [en]sure [that] a sustainable long-term supply of groundwater is available that will not adversely impact existing groundwater users.

Policy LU-13.1: Adequacy of Water Supply. Coordinate water infrastructure planning with land use planning to maintain an acceptable availability of a high-quality sustainable water supply. Ensure that new development includes both indoor and outdoor water conservation measures to reduce demand.

Policy LU-13.2: Commitment of Water Supply. Require new development to identify adequate water resources, in accordance with state law, to support the development prior to approval.

Policy COS-4.1: Water Conservation. Require development to reduce the waste of potable water through use of efficient technologies and conservation efforts that minimize the County's dependence on imported water and conserve groundwater resources.

Policy COS-4.2: Drought-Efficient Landscaping. Require efficient irrigation systems and, in new development, encourage the use of native plant species and non-invasive drought-tolerant/low-water use plants in landscaping.

Policy COS-4.3: Stormwater Filtration. Maximize stormwater filtration and/or infiltration in areas that are not subject to high groundwater by maximizing the natural drainage patterns and the retention of natural vegetation and other pervious surfaces. This policy shall not apply in areas with high groundwater, where raising the water table could cause septic system failures, moisture damage to building slabs, and/or other problems.

Policy COS-4.4: Groundwater Contamination. Require land uses with a high potential to contaminate groundwater to take appropriate measures to protect water supply sources.

Policy COS-5.2: Impervious Surfaces. Require development to minimize the use of directly connected impervious surfaces and to retain stormwater run-off caused from the development footprint at or near the site of generation.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to groundwater supply:

In addition to the following mitigation measures, measures, Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, and Hyd-1.5, identified above, would also apply to groundwater supplies and recharge.

Hyd-2.2 Implement the Groundwater Ordinance to balance groundwater resources with new development. Also revise the Ordinance Relating to Water

Conservation for Landscaping (currently Zoning Ordinance Sections 6712 through 6725) to further water conservation through the use of recycled water.

Hyd-2.3 Establish a water credits program between the County and the Borrego Water District to provide a streamlined and consistent process for the permanent cessation of outdoor water intensive uses such as irrigated agricultural or golf course land.

Hyd-2.4 Coordinate with the San Diego County Water Authority and other water agencies to coordinate land use planning with water supply planning, and implementation and enhancement of water conservation programs.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could alter groundwater supplies or recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIIc. Hydrology and Water Quality (Erosion or Siltation)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to VIIIa. Development associated with implementation of the CAP could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area that could result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs. They would be subject to the previously analyzed design features and mitigation measures from the General Plan Program EIR listed below:

Policy LU-6.5: Sustainable Stormwater Management. Ensure that development minimizes the use of impervious surfaces and incorporates other Low Impact Development (LID) techniques as well as a combination of site design, source control, and stormwater best management practices, where applicable and consistent with the County’s LID Handbook.

Policy LU-6.9: Development Conformance with Topography. Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading, incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site, and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

Policy COS-5.3: Downslope Protection. Require development to be appropriately sited and to incorporate measures to retain natural flow regimes, thereby protecting downslope areas from erosion, capturing runoff to adequately allow for filtration and/or infiltration, and protecting downstream biological resources.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to erosion and siltation:

In addition to the following mitigation measures, measures Hyd-1.2, Hyd-1.3, and Hyd-1.5, identified, above would also apply to erosion or siltation.

Hyd-3.1 Implement and revise, as necessary, ordinances to require new development to be located down and away from ridgelines, conform to the natural topography, not significantly alter dominant physical characteristics of the site, and maximize natural drainage and topography when conveying stormwater.

Hyd-3.2 Implement and revise as necessary the RPO to limit development on steep slopes. Also incorporate Board Policy I-73, the Hillside Development Policy, into the RPO to the extent that it will allow for one comprehensive approach to steep-slope protections.

Hyd-3.3 Implement the Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance to protect development sites against erosion and instability.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **VIIIId. Hydrology and Water Quality (Flooding)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?



YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See responses to VIIIa and VIIIc. Development associated with implementation of the CAP could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs. They would be subject to the previously analyzed design features and mitigation measures from the General Plan Program EIR, as listed above. In addition, reduction of GHG emissions will help mitigate the impacts of climate change, such as flooding from extreme weather events.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIIe. Hydrology and Water Quality (Exceed Capacity of Stormwater Systems)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Development implementing the CAP measures that create new areas of impervious surfaces, such as a pedestrian or bike pathway or electricity generating facility, could create new runoff or contribute to existing runoff water. Future County projects implementing CAP would comply with County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs that are aimed at reducing adverse stormwater effects. CAP projects would be subject to the previously analyzed design features and mitigation measures from the General Plan Program EIR, as listed above in VIIIa and VIIIc.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIII.f. Hydrology and Water Quality (Housing within a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

YES

☐

NO

☒

The CAP does not propose any new housing projects and is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, new housing beyond that anticipated in the General Plan would not result from implementation of the CAP.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIII.g. Hydrology and Water Quality (Impeding or Redirecting Flood Flows)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Implementation of CAP policies and Significance Guidelines for land use projects is not likely to affect flood hazard areas. The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not increase flood risk.

CAP measures, including the development of an expanded network of bike and pedestrian facilities, would have the potential to be located in flood zones. However, as identified in the General Plan Program EIR, projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The projects would be subject to the policies previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR, as listed below. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to expose people to substantial risks of any kind, including flooding.

Policy LU-6.5: Sustainable Stormwater Management. Ensure that development minimizes the use of impervious surfaces and incorporates other Low Impact Development (LID) techniques as well as a combination of site design, source control, and stormwater best management practices, where applicable and consistent with the County's LID Handbook.

Policy LU-6.10: Protection from Hazards. Require that development be located and designed to protect property and residents from the risks of natural and [hu]man-induced hazards.

Policy S-9.2: Development in Floodplains. Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal flood proofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.

Policy S-10.2: Use of Natural Channels. Require the use of natural channels for County flood control facilities, except where necessary to protect existing structures from a current flooding problem and where natural channel use is deemed infeasible. The alternative must achieve the same level of biological and other environmental protection, such as water quality, hydrology, and public safety.

Policy S-10.4: Stormwater Management. Require development to incorporate low impact design, hydromodification management, and other measures to minimize stormwater impacts on drainage and flood control facilities.

Policy S-10.6: Stormwater Hydrology. Ensure [that] development avoids diverting drainages, increasing velocities, and altering flow rates to off-site areas to minimize adverse impacts to the area's existing hydrology.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIIh. Hydrology and Water Quality (Dam Inundation and Flood Hazards)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See responses to VIIIg. The CAP encourages strategies and projects intended to reduce GHG emissions. The types of improvements that could result would comply with County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs. Future County projects implementing the CAP would be subject to the previously analyzed policies in the General Plan Program EIR, as listed above, that are designed to minimize flooding hazards. In addition, reduction of GHG emissions will help mitigate the impacts of climate change, such as dam inundation and flood hazards from sea level rise and extreme weather events. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**VIIIi. Hydrology and Water Quality (Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow Hazards)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The CAP encourages strategies and projects intended to reduce GHG emissions. The types of improvements that could result would comply with County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs. Therefore, development associated with implementation of the CAP would not result in placing people or structures in significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. For this reason, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could result in effects from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**IXa. Land Use and Planning (Physical Division of an Established Community)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could physically divide an established community?

YES

☐

NO

☒

The CAP encourages strategies and projects intended to reduce GHG emissions. Additionally, the CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth. The types of improvements that could result would comply with County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that could physically divide an established community beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**IXb. Land Use and Planning (Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to IXa. The CAP policies that will be used for land use projects are consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated land use impacts.

The CAP proposes strategies and measures to reduce GHG emissions. The CAP adheres to the County's General Plan, including existing County policies, building codes, and Zoning Ordinance. Strategies and measures recommended within the CAP would not conflict with existing policies. If conflicts were to occur, the proposed CAP strategies and measures would generally result in greater avoidance or mitigation of environmental effects, as the CAP is designed to mitigate adverse environmental impacts associated with global climate change.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**IXc. Land Use and Planning (Conflicts with HCPs or NCCPs)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to IVe regarding compliance with biological plan and policies, including HCPs or NCCPs. The types of improvements that could result from implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would be required to comply with applicable HCPs and NCCPs. Regulatory processes to ensure compliance are already in place and would not be altered by the CAP. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that could conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Xa. Mineral Resources (Mineral Resource Availability)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, such as proposing incompatible development?

YES

☐

NO

☒

There are three general categories of mineral resources important to the County of San Diego:

- **Construction Materials.** These include sand, gravel, and crushed rock. This is economically the most important category of mineral resources to the region.
- **Industrial and Chemical Mineral Materials.** These include limestone, dolomite, marble (except where used as construction aggregate), specialty sands, clays, phosphate, borates and gypsum, feldspar, talc, building stone, and dimension stone.
- **Metallic and Rare Minerals.** These include precious metals (silver, platinum), iron and other ferro-alloy metals, copper, lead, zinc, gemstones and semi-precious materials, and optical-grade calcite.

The CAP policies and Significance Guidelines intended to be used for land use projects are consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated land use impacts.

Implementation of CAP measures would comply with County policies and regulations and the General Plan policies and programs as evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to result in the loss of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, the CAP and its potential recommended improvements would be consistent with the County's policies and regulations.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **Xb. Mineral Resources (Mineral Resource Recovery Sites)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to Xa. Development implementing the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not cause effects related to the loss of a resource recovery site. Thus, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Xla. Noise (Excessive Noise Levels)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in exposure of any existing or reasonably foreseeable future noise sensitive land uses to exterior or interior noise, including existing and planned Mobility Element roadways, railroads, and all other noise sources (with the exception of airports), in excess of any of the following:

a. Exterior Locations:

- Roadways and all other noise sources: 60 or 65 dBA (CNEL) in the Noise Compatibility Guidelines as identified in Table 2.11-9 or an increase of 10 dBA (CNEL) over pre-existing noise in areas where the ambient noise level is 49 dBA (CNEL) or less.
- Railroads: 60 dBA (CNEL) or an increase of 10 dBA (CNEL) over pre-existing noise in areas where the ambient noise level is 49 dBA (CNEL) or less.

b. Interior Locations

- 45 dBA (CNEL)

YES

☐

NO

☒

Noise would likely be evaluated during the regulatory process for any land use projects implementing CAP policies and the Significance Guidelines. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Noise increases from population growth that occurs with implementation of the General Plan Program EIR would be expected to be the same with or without implementation of CAP measures and strategies, and, thus, the CAP policies would not independently create effects related to noise.

The CAP would encourage projects that may result in temporary new sources of noise associated with energy efficiency retrofits, expansion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities,



and installation of distributed renewable energy systems. These projects would have the potential to generate noise during construction.

The CAP projects identified above would comply with existing County policies and regulations and the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs. They would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures as previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. None of the project types that may implement the CAP are expected to expose and existing or future noise sensitive land uses to excessive exterior or interior noise during operation.

Policy LU-2.8: Mitigation of Development Impacts. Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations, dust, odor, aesthetic impairment, and/or are detrimental to human health and safety.

Policy N-1.4: Adjacent Jurisdiction Noise Standards. Incorporate the noise standards of an adjacent jurisdiction into the evaluation of a proposed project when it has the potential to impact the noise environment of that jurisdiction.

Policy N-1.5: Regional Noise Impacts. Work with local and regional transit agencies and/or other jurisdictions, as appropriate, to provide services or facilities to minimize regional traffic noise and other sources of noise in the County.

Policy N-2.1: Development Impacts to Noise Sensitive Land Uses. Require an acoustical study to identify inappropriate noise levels where development may directly result in any existing or future noise sensitive land uses being subject to noise levels equal to or greater than 60 CNEL [Community Noise Equivalent Level] and require mitigation for sensitive uses in compliance with the noise standards listed in Table N-2 of the Noise Element in the General Plan.

Policy N-4.1: Traffic Noise. Require that projects proposing General Plan amendments that increase the average daily traffic beyond what is anticipated in [the] General Plan do not increase cumulative traffic noise to off-site noise sensitive land uses beyond acceptable levels.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to excessive noise levels:

Noi-1.1 Require an acoustical analysis whenever a new development may result in any existing or future noise sensitive land uses being subject to on-site noise levels of 60 dBA [A-weighted decibels] (CNEL) or greater, or other land uses that may result in noise levels exceeding the "Acceptable" standard in the Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table N-1 in the Noise Element).

Noi-1.2 Revise the Guidelines for Determining Significance for new developments where the exterior noise level on patios or balconies for multi-

family residences or mixed-use development exceeds 65 dBA (CNEL); a solid noise barrier [should be] incorporated into the building design of balconies and patios for units that exceed 65 dBA (CNEL) while still maintaining the openness of the patio or balcony.

Noi-1.3 Require an acoustical study for projects proposing amendments to the County General Plan Land Use Element and/or Mobility Element that propose a significant increase to the average daily traffic due to trips associated with the project beyond those anticipated in the General Plan.

Noi-1.7 Work with project applicants during the scoping phase of proposed projects to take into consideration impacts resulting from on-site noise generation to noise sensitive land uses located outside the County's jurisdictional authority. The County will notify and coordinate with the appropriate jurisdiction(s) to determine appropriate project design techniques and/or mitigation.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would result in exposure of existing or reasonably foreseeable future noise sensitive land uses to excessive exterior or interior noise levels in excess of standards established in the threshold beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIb. Noise (Excessive Groundborne Vibration)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would result in exposure of vibration sensitive uses to groundborne vibration and noise equal to or in excess of the levels identified in County Groundborne Vibration and Noise Standards, or if new sensitive land uses would be located in the vicinity of ground-borne vibration inducing land uses such as railroads or mining operations?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to XIa. Development associated with implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would have the potential to expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction; however, future CAP projects would comply with existing County policies and regulations and the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs. The projects would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures that were previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to generate excessive vibration or noise.

Policy N-3.1: Groundborne Vibration. Use the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Railroad Administration guidelines, where appropriate, to limit the extent of exposure that sensitive uses may have to groundborne vibration from trains, construction equipment, and other sources.

Policy N-6.3: High-Noise Equipment. Require development to limit the frequency of use of motorized landscaping equipment, parking lot sweepers, and other high-noise equipment if their activity will result in noise that affects residential zones.

Policy N-6.4: Hours of Construction. Require development to limit the hours of operation, as appropriate, for non-emergency construction and maintenance, trash collection, and parking lot sweeper activity near noise sensitive land uses.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to groundborne vibrations:

Noi-2.1: For Land Use Designations defined in Table 2.11-14, a ground-borne vibration technical study shall be required for proposed land uses within the following distances from the Sprinter Rail Line right-of-way and the property line: 600 feet of a Category 1 Land Use, 200 feet of a Category 2 Land Use, and 120 feet of a Category 3 Land Use. If necessary, mitigation shall be required for land uses in compliance with the standards listed in Tables 2 and 3 of the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Noise.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in exposure of vibration sensitive uses to groundborne vibration and noise equal to or in excess of the identified standards or locate new sensitive land uses in the vicinity of ground-borne vibration inducing land uses beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIc. Noise (Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels which would exceed the sound level limits specified in San Diego County Code Section 36.404, Sound Level Limits, at the property line of the property on which the noise is produced or at any location on a property that is receiving the noise?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Noise would likely be evaluated during the regulatory process for any future land use projects implementing CAP policies and the Significance Guidelines.. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Noise increases from population growth that occurs with implementation of the General Plan, would be expected to be the same with or without the CAP; thus, CAP policies would not independently create effects related to noise.

Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations and policies and programs that were evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. Furthermore, perceptible increases in local traffic volumes are not anticipated as a result of implementing individual CAP projects. Thus, no increase in ambient noise levels related to travel activity is expected. Conversely, the CAP includes numerous recommendations designed to reduce the number and length of vehicle trips in the County, which would decrease ambient noise levels.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels that would exceed specified noise limits beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XId. Noise (Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels during construction which, together with noise from all sources, would exceed the standards listed in San Diego County Code Sections 36.408 and 36.409 or the County Noise Ordinance Section 36.410, Section 36.413, Section 36.414, or Section 36,416?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to Xlc. Development associated with implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would have minor temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Future CAP projects would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the policies and programs as evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. Furthermore, none of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to generate substantial noise levels. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above applicable noise

level standards beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**Xle. Noise (Excessive Noise Exposure from a Public or Private Airport)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public or private airport? The level of noise acceptable to new development in the vicinity of proposed new airports, active military airports being converted to civilian use, and existing civilian airports is established as an annual CNEL of 60 dBA?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Noise would likely be evaluated during the regulatory process for any future land use projects implementing CAP policies and the Significance Guidelines. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs. They would be subject to the design features and mitigation measures as evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. The CAP does not recommend any particular policy or strategy within airport use plans or public airports. The CAP does recommend energy-efficient retrofitting and installation of distributed renewable energy systems, which may occur within 2 miles of a public airport or airport land use plan, and could expose workers or residents to cumulative sources of noise. However, implementation of the CAP projects in compliance with General Plan Program EIR policies, the 1990 California Airport Noise Standards and applicable ALUCPs, would reduce potential direct impacts related to exposure to noise from public use airports.

Policy LU-4.9: Airport Compatibility. [En]sure the noise compatibility of any development project that may be affected by noise from public or private airports and helipads during project review by coordinating, as appropriate, with appropriate agencies such as the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Policy N-4.9: Airport Compatibility. [En]sure the noise compatibility of any development project that may be affected by noise from public or private airports and helipads during project review by coordinating, as appropriate, with appropriate agencies such as the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Policy S-15.1: Land Use Compatibility. Require land uses surrounding airports to be compatible with the operation of each airport.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to airport noise:

Noi-5.1 Use the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) as guidance/reference during development review of projects that are planned within an Airport Influence Area (AIA). Any projects that are within the AIA shall be submitted to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) for review.

Noi-5.2 Evaluate noise exposure impacts related to a private airport or heliport use or consistency with the FAA standards.

Noi-5.3 Consult with the FAA standards and the County Noise Ordinance as a guide for assessing noise impacts from private airports and helipads.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public or private airport beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIIa. Population and Housing (Population Growth)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The measures within the CAP and Significance Guidelines are not growth inducing; rather, the CAP would implement strategies geared toward lower emissions and greater energy efficiency by increasing live/work uses. Furthermore, future development and infrastructure implementing the CAP are consistent with forecasted growth for the unincorporated County as identified and evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Growth that occurs within the county is a result of people moving from another area, newly formed households, and new members of the workforce. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would induce substantial population growth in an area, either

directly or indirectly, beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIIb. Population and Housing (Displacement of Housing)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Although CAP strategies and measures encourage energy-efficient retrofits for existing homes, these homes are not expected to be displaced; thus, replacement housing would not be necessary. For this reason, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIIc. Population and Housing (Displacement of People)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to XIIb. Development associated with implementation of the CAP would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. For this reason, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIIla. Public Services (Fire Protection Services)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts

associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Within the unincorporated region's emergency services system, fire and emergency medical services are provided by Fire Protection Districts (FPDs), County Service Areas (CSAs), and CalFire. Collectively, there are more than 2,800 firefighters responsible for protecting the San Diego region. Generally, each agency is responsible for structural and wildland fire protection within its area of responsibility. However, mutual and automatic aid agreements enable non-lead fire agencies to respond to fire emergencies outside of their district boundaries. Interdependencies that exist among the region's fire protection agencies are primarily voluntary, as no local governmental agency can exert authority over another.

While the CAP may result in facilities that require fire protection services, the impact would be consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself does not result in an accelerated deterioration of facilities or need for new facilities. Projects pursuant to the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, as well as General Plan Program EIR policies and programs.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would have substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of fire protection services beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.



**XIIIb. Public Services (Police Protection Services)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection services?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The San Diego County Sheriff’s Department (SDSD) is the chief law enforcement agency in the unincorporated County. SDSD is the fourth largest sheriff’s department in the U.S. It has a service area of approximately 4,200 square miles and serves a population of more than 870,000 people. Approximately 448,700 of these residents are located in the unincorporated areas of the County, while the remainder are located in the following nine cities that contract with SDSD for police protection services: Vista, San Marcos, Santee, Lemon Grove, Imperial Beach, Poway, Encinitas, Del Mar, and Solana Beach. The nine cities that contract with the SDSD typically provide more comprehensive law enforcement services than the unincorporated County. For example, most contract cities have law enforcement personnel dedicated solely to traffic enforcement. The unincorporated County, on the other hand, relies on California Highway Patrol officers for traffic enforcement on highways and local roads. SDSD has approximately 4,000 employees, 800 vehicles, and a fleet of helicopters. SDSD operates eight major detention facilities and provides security for 171 courtrooms and 10 courthouses throughout the County of San Diego.

While the CAP may result in facilities that require police protection services, the impact would be consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself does not result in an accelerated deterioration of facilities or the need for new facilities. Future projects pursuant to the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, if warranted.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would have substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of police protection services beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIIIc. Public Services (School Services)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for schools?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Public schools and educational facilities are mandated by the State Department of Education and administered by the San Diego County Board of Education and the San Diego County Office of Education. Thirty-seven unified, elementary, and high school districts provide service to the residents of the unincorporated County. Nine of these districts serve the unincorporated area only, while 28 serve both unincorporated and incorporated areas. In total, approximately 639 schools serve the unincorporated County, with an approximate total student enrollment of 444,487. The average pupil: teacher ratio for schools serving the unincorporated County is 1 teacher to every 21 students, and the average class size is approximately 24 students. Although one type of district might overlap with another type of district, districts of the same classification do not overlap with one another. For example, an elementary school district and a high school district might serve the same area; however, two elementary school districts would not have overlapping areas.

The CAP and Significance Guidelines do not contain any strategies or measures that would increase school enrollment. The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself does not result in an accelerated deterioration of facilities or need for new facilities due to increased student population. Future projects implementing CAP measures would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, if warranted.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would have substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of school services beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIIIId. Public Services (Other Public Facilities)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for other public facilities?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Development associated with implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not be expected to increase the demand for libraries or other governmental services to the extent that new facilities would be required. The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself would not result in an accelerated deterioration of facilities or need for new facilities. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public facilities beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XIVa. Recreation (Deterioration of Parks and Recreation Facilities)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Parks and preserves provide recreational opportunities while protecting valuable natural and cultural resources. The County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) maintains and enhances the quality of life for residents and visitors through a comprehensive program of acquisition, development, and maintenance of recreation facilities, including local and regional parks, fishing lakes, community centers, special use facilities, and preserves. In addition, a system of regional and community trails

further enhances and augments public recreational opportunities and experiences throughout the San Diego region. These facilities cover more than 40,000 acres and are operated and maintained by County DPR staff, volunteers, and service contracts.

CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself would not result in increased physical deterioration of parks and recreational facilities. Conversely, the CAP and Significance Guidelines promote expansion of the current network of bike and pedestrian trails, which could provide additional recreational facilities within the County, and possibly lessen wear on existing facilities. Projects pursuant to the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, if warranted.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **XIVb. Recreation (Construction of New Recreation Facilities)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which would have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

YES

☐

NO

☒

The CAP and Significance Guidelines encourage development of additional bike and pedestrian trails in the County. Construction of these facilities could potentially result in adverse impacts to the environment. However, environmental impacts associated with these types of facilities are anticipated to be minimal, as such facilities would likely be constructed within existing rights-of-way. Development activities associated with bicycle and pedestrian trail construction pursuant to the CAP and Significance Guidelines would be subject to the policies, design features, and mitigation measures as previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR (listed below).

Policy M-12.5: Future Trails. Explore opportunities to designate or construct future trails on County-owned lands, lands within the Multiple Species Conservation

Program (MSCP), or other lands already under public ownership or proposed for public acquisition.

Policy M-12.9: Environmental and Agricultural Resources. Site and design specific trail segments to minimize impacts to sensitive environmental resources, ecological systems, and agricultural lands within the MSCP preserves, conform siting and use of trails to County MSCP Subarea Plans and wildlife-agency-approved MSCP management plans.

Policy M-12.10: Recreational and Educational Resources. Design trail routes that meet a public need and highlight the County's biological, recreational, and educational resources, including natural, scenic, cultural, and historic resources.

Policy COS-21.2: Location of Parks. Locate new local parks and recreation facilities near other community-oriented public facilities such as schools, libraries, and recreation centers, where feasible, so that they may function as the "heart" of a community.

Policy COS-21.3: Park Design. Design parks that reflect community character and identity, incorporate local natural and cultural landscapes and features, and consider the surrounding land uses and urban form and cultural and historic resources.

Policy COS-23.1: Public Access. Provide public access to natural and cultural (where allowed) resources through effective planning that conserves the County's native wildlife, enhances and restores a continuous network of connected natural habitat, and protects water resources.

General Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measures specific to new recreation facilities:

Rec-2.1 Update Community Plans to reflect the character and vision for each individual community; address civic needs in a community and encourage the co-location of uses; establish and maintain greenbelts between communities; prioritize infrastructure improvements and the provision of public facilities for villages and community cores; and identify pedestrian routes. With these issues addressed in community plans, potential impacts to visual resources, community character, natural resources, cultural resources, and traffic will be substantially lessened should new or expanded recreational facilities be needed in a given community.

Rec-2.2 Use community design guidelines as a resource when designing park and recreation facilities. This will help ensure that such facilities are consistent with community character.

Rec-2.3 Amend the Subdivision Ordinance to require new residential development to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous road, environmentally sensitive pathway/trail, and recreation/open space networks. Also add new conservation-oriented design guidelines for rural lands projects as part

of this amendment. These measures will assist in the planning for recreational facilities as new development is proposed while minimizing impacts to sensitive resources and community character.

Rec-2.4 Develop procedures to consider designating trails that correspond to existing (non-designated) trails, paths, or unpaved roadbeds that already have a disturbed tread. This will minimize new impacts to the natural environment and will potentially benefit existing trail users.

Rec-2.5 Through implementation of Resource Management Plans, monitor and manage preserves and trails such that environmental resources do not become impacted as a result of soil erosion, flooding, fire hazard, or other environmental or [hu]man-made effects. Any impacts identified to environmental resources will be restored in accordance with the management directives within the Resource Management Plans.

Rec-2.6 Develop procedures to encourage the involvement and input of the agricultural community in matters relating to trails on or adjacent to agricultural lands, and place a priority on the protection of agriculture.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVa. Transportation and Traffic (Unincorporated County Traffic and LOS Standards)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would;

- a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections); or
- b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Traffic Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Traffic Guidelines incorporate standards from the County

of San Diego Public Road Standards and Public Facilities Element (PFE), the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program, and the Congestion Management Program (CMP).

The County of San Diego Department of Public Works Road Section is responsible for maintaining nearly 2,000 miles of County Mobility Element roadways and other transportation facilities within the unincorporated County.

Implementation of CAP strategies and measures and the Significance Guidelines would increase the availability of transit service for County residents, add additional bike and pedestrian facilities, and discourage single-occupancy vehicle use. Achieving each of these goals would result in a reduction in traffic loads, which would reduce the number of vehicle trips, volume-to-capacity ratio, and intersection congestion within the County. Furthermore, no proposed strategy or measure would directly increase traffic in relation to the existing traffic load or capacity of the street system. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated deterioration of facilities or need for new facilities.

Future County CAP projects would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR-specified features and mitigation. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to generate significant traffic volumes. Because the CAP would serve to reduce the amount of automobiles being used for transportation and not result in projects that would generate substantial traffic volumes, the existing traffic operations on unincorporated County roads would not be degraded; rather, traffic operations may be improved and experience less congestion.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system or exceed an established level of service standard beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **XVb. Transportation and Traffic (Adjacent Cities Traffic and LOS Standards)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would:

- a. cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial

increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections); or

- b. exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), of which the CMP is a means to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate the equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak-hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways and their associated costs, and identify appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified.

See response to XVa. Implementing CAP policies for land use projects could affect congestion by reducing vehicle miles traveled. The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, implementation of CAP policies would not result in accelerated deterioration of facilities or need for new facilities, and, in this case, would reduce road congestion both in the unincorporated County as well as throughout other jurisdictions as motorists travel throughout the region. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to generate significant traffic volumes. Because implementation of the CAP measures would not create substantial new traffic volumes and would serve to reduce the amount of automobiles being used for transportation that otherwise may have traveled through multiple cities and jurisdictions to reach their destinations, the existing traffic operations on roadways throughout the region would not be degraded; rather, traffic operations may be improved and experience less congestion.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system or



exceed an established level of service standard in adjacent cities beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVc. Transportation and Traffic (Rural Road Safety)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in substantially increased hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The CAP and Significance Guidelines do not include any strategy or measure that would promote the development of hazardous design features or incompatible uses. Rather, the CAP promotes the development of new bike and pedestrian facilities built to current standards, which would provide greater safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers. Thus, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in substantially increased hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVd. Transportation and Traffic (Emergency Access)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in inadequate emergency access?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The CAP recommends strategies and measures that would reduce the number of automobiles in the County and reduce traffic congestion, which may make access for emergency vehicles easier and more efficient. No strategy or measure proposed within the CAP and Significance Guidelines would result in the development of uses or facilities that would degrade emergency access. Thus, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in inadequate emergency access beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVe. Transportation and Traffic (Parking Capacity)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in inadequate parking capacity?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The CAP recommends strategies and measures that would reduce the number of automobiles traveling in the County. The reduction in travelers using automobiles for mobility would also create a reduction in the need for parking availability at their destinations. Additionally, the nature of projects that may implement the CAP would not generate high volumes of traffic or destinations requiring substantial parking availability. Thus, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in inadequate parking capacity beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVf. Transportation and Traffic (Alternative Transportation)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Supporting and increasing access to alternative transportation is a major focus of the CAP. The CAP and Significance Guidelines would enhance adopted policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation. Thus, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVla. Utilities and Service Systems (Wastewater Treatment Requirements)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The CAP would encourage increased efficiency of wastewater treatment by reducing energy demand during the treatment process. Thus, there would be no increase in demand for wastewater treatment exceeding treatment requirements. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself would not result in an accelerated deterioration of facilities or need for new facilities. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, if warranted. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to generate wastewater.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVIb. Utilities and Service Systems (New Water and Wastewater Treatment Facilities)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would require or result in new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures. The CAP would not encourage new growth; rather it would encourage more efficient growth including increased water conservation and more efficient water use, resulting in less wastewater. None of the types of projects that may implement the CAP are expected to require significant water or wastewater services. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVIc. Utilities and Service Systems (Sufficient Stormwater Drainage Facilities)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would require or result in new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself would not result in an accelerated deterioration of facilities or need for new facilities.

Implementation of CAP strategies and measures and Significance Guidelines would not directly increase stormwater runoff and may help contain stormwater in relation to the load and capacity of existing and planned drainage systems. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, if warranted. Furthermore, the CAP would encourage the use of stormwater runoff as a residential and commercial water supply source. Therefore, the facilities would be less inundated, and available capacity would not be compromised.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVIId. Utilities and Service Systems (Adequate Water Supplies)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would: 1) result in a demand for water that exceeds existing entitlements and resources, or necessitates new or expanded entitlements; or 2) substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

Development associated with implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would increase water conservation and efficiency practices. The Utilities and Service Systems section of the General Plan Program EIR concluded that development in the County may lead to insufficient water resources due to land uses and development. The CAP does not encourage land uses or development that would lead to increased water consumption. Rather, the CAP includes a number of measures that promote the efficient management and use of water resources, such as using greywater, implementing water conservation programs, and adopting water-efficient landscape ordinances that would reduce water consumption.

The CAP is consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself would not result in any reduction in availability of water entitlements and resources. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, if warranted. Furthermore, the CAP would encourage the conservation and management of water sources for residential and commercial use.

See response VIIIb for discussion and General Plan policies and mitigation specific to groundwater recharge. Development associated with implementation of the CAP, such as a pedestrian or bike pathway, an electricity-generating facility, or retrofitting an existing building are generally not the types of projects that would interfere with groundwater supplies, and so would not create the potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would have an effect on sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, create the need for new or expanded entitlements, or deplete groundwater supplies or recharge beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

#### **XVle. Utilities and Service Systems (Adequate Wastewater Facilities)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of

substantial importance” that would result in a determination by the wastewater provider which serves or may serve the project area that it has inadequate capacity to service the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

YES

☐

NO

☒

See response to XVla. The CAP and Significance Guidelines are consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself would not result in any reduction in wastewater treatment service capacity. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, if warranted. Furthermore, the CAP would encourage the conservation and management of water for residential and commercial use.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments, or that its capacity would be beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVlf. Utilities and Service Systems (Adequate Landfill Capacity)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would have effects on the project’s ability to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

YES

☐

NO

☒

The CAP and Significance Guidelines are consistent with the land use and population assumptions evaluated in the General Plan Program EIR. CAP policies and measures do not regulate land use or direct growth; rather they promote smart-growth strategies found in the General Plan, such as mixed use development. Regulatory strategies and measures themselves do not create new population or employment (except for

temporary construction-related employment), but rather accommodate population and employment growth; thus, the CAP itself would not result in a substantial reduction in landfill capacity, increase in the waste stream, or need for solid waste collection services. In addition, the CAP includes numerous measures designed to promote recycling and decrease the County's overall waste stream, therefore, potentially lengthening the lifespan of landfills. Future County projects implementing the CAP would comply with existing County policies and regulations, the General Plan Program EIR policies and programs, and the previously analyzed General Plan Program EIR mitigation measures, if warranted.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would have effects on the project's ability to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVIg. Utilities and Service Systems (Solid Waste Regulations)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would have effects on the project's ability to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

See response to XVI f. The CAP and Significance Guidelines do not recommend any strategy or measure that does not comply with applicable solid waste regulations. Conversely, the CAP promotes recycling and measures to reduce the County's solid waste stream. For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would have effects on the project's ability to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVIh. Utilities and Service Systems (Energy)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or "new information of substantial importance" that would require or result in the construction of new energy production and/or transmission facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

The General Plan Program EIR discusses potentially significant impacts that may result due to the need for new or expanded energy facilities to accommodate projected increases in energy demand. However, there are multiple goals and policies that are included to reduce energy consumption and specific to the need to develop new energy facilities as listed below

Policy COS-14.7: Encourage development projects that use energy recovery, photovoltaic, and wind energy.

Goal COS-15: Building design and construction techniques that reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs, while protecting public health and contributing to a more sustainable environment.

Policy COS-15.1: Require that new buildings be designed and constructed in accordance with “green building” programs that incorporate techniques and materials that maximize energy efficiency, incorporate the use of sustainable resources and recycled materials, and reduce emissions of GHGs and toxic air contaminants.

Policy COS-15.2: Promote and, as appropriate, develop standards for the retrofit of existing buildings to incorporate design elements, heating and cooling, water, energy, and other elements that improve their environmental sustainability and reduce GHG.

Policy COS-15.3: Require all new County facilities and the renovation and expansion of existing County buildings to meet identified “green building” programs that demonstrate energy efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable technologies.

Policy COS-15.4: Require development to minimize energy impacts from new buildings in accordance with or exceeding Title 24 energy standards.

Policy COS-15.5: Encourage energy conservation and efficiency in existing development through energy efficiency audits and adoption of energy saving measures resulting from the audits.

The CAP would implement many elements of these goals and policies to reduce energy consumption, retrofit existing structures, and provide alternative energy sources. The results of these actions would serve to minimize future energy demand and possibly reduce the need for new or expanded energy facilities throughout the County. Additionally, the types of energy generation projects that may implement the CAP would be smaller alternative energy generation facilities such as small-scale PV and other distributed renewable energy technologies on homes, businesses, and County facilities to provide alternative sources of energy. The CAP would not result in large, mass energy production and transmission facilities that could result in potential environmental impacts as anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR. The small energy generation projects that would



implement the CAP would not generate environmental impacts that are outside of the scope of potential impacts identified within the General Plan Program EIR and would be subject to all County policies and mitigation to minimize any potential environmental effects.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would require or result in new or expanded energy production and/or transmission facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVIIa. Global Climate Change (Compliance with AB 32)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would conflict with the goals and strategies of AB 32 or the achievement of 1990 emission levels by 2020?

YES  
☐

NO  
☒

California has adopted a wide variety of regulations aimed at reducing the state’s GHG emissions. AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires California to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 directs CARB to develop and implement regulations that reduce statewide GHG emissions. The *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan) was approved by CARB in December 2008 and outlines the state’s plan to achieve the GHG reductions required in AB 32. The Scoping Plan contains the primary strategies California will implement to achieve a reduction of 169 million MT CO<sub>2</sub>e, or approximately 28% from the state’s projected 2020 emissions levels. In the Scoping Plan, CARB encourages local governments to adopt a reduction goal for municipal operations emissions and move toward establishing similar goals for community emissions that parallel the state commitment to reduce GHGs. The Scoping Plan recommends that local governments consider adopting a goal of 15% below current emissions levels to assist the state in implementing AB 32.

The CAP presents a community-wide baseline GHG emissions inventory for the County, provides projections of emissions in 2020 under a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario, and describes the community’s emissions reductions target of 15% below the baseline (2005) by 2020. The emissions inventory identifies the sources, distribution, and amount of GHG emissions by emission sector, including transportation, energy consumption, agriculture, water consumption, and solid waste.

The County has prepared a 2005 GHG emissions inventory for the County of San Diego, which is included in the CAP. Total community-wide emissions were determined to be 4,512,580 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e in the baseline year 2005. Transportation-related activities

contributed more than 58% of the community-wide annual GHG emissions. Electricity and natural gas consumption contributed 25% of the emissions; potable water contributed 5%; agriculture, including livestock made up approximately 4%; and solid waste, wastewater, and other sources accounted for the remaining 7%.

The CAP includes measures to reduce community-wide GHG emissions for discretionary land use projects in a manner consistent with AB 32. Development associated with implementation of the CAP would allow the County to meet the 15% community-wide GHG reduction target by 2020, which is consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan and CEQA Guidelines.

The CAP identifies several strategies to not only attain the County's GHG reduction goals, but exceed them by achieving an 18% reduction in baseline levels by 2020. The effect of these strategies with anticipated GHG reductions from statewide legislation (i.e., AB 1493 vehicle emission standards, low-carbon fuel standards, and renewable portfolio standards) would decrease GHG emissions by approximately 1,509,600 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year by 2020.

While implementation of projects encouraged by the CAP could result in construction-related activities which generate GHG emissions, these emissions are finite and limited to active construction activities; subsiding upon completion. In general, construction activities associated with implementation of the CAP would result in an overall reduction in energy consumption.

Implementation of the CAP measures could result in the construction of facilities that might produce ongoing operational GHG emissions, such as electricity-generating systems. Development of facilities as implementation of the CAP are generally associated with long-term reductions in GHG emissions, and the estimated net GHG reduction associated with facility development is a key factor to including the measure in the CAP. The CAP has analyzed the impacts of GHGs pursuant to its adoption, and would result in a lowering of GHGs from levels that would occur without its adoption.

The Significance Guidelines allows for a consistent and objective evaluation of significant effects to climate change for future projects. The Significance Guidelines provide a substantiated approach to assessing significance for use by future projects that comply with current regulation (AB 32). The Significance Guidelines allow the County to assess the level of mitigation that would represent a fair share of emissions reductions necessary statewide to achieve AB 32 targets. The County's documents provide clear guidance based on substantial evidence to assessing whether projects and plans would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change.

The CAP and Significance Guidelines have demonstrated compliance with current legislation regarding GHG emission reductions. Furthermore, future County projects implementing the CAP and Significance Guidelines would comply with existing County policies and regulations, and the General Plan policies and programs, such as those

included in the Conservation and Open Space Element and previously analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR.

The CAP recommendations and Significance Guidelines are consistent with and similar to the mitigation measures provided to reduce impacts to global climate change presented and analyzed in the General Plan Program EIR as CC-1.1 through CC-1.19. The preparation and implementation of the CAP fulfills mitigation measure CC-1.2. The other mitigation measures include items such as working with other agencies to address climate changes issues; reviewing, updating, and implementing existing County policies to address climate change issues; providing public information; developing a Strategic Energy plan; promoting recycling, water conservation, and alternative modes of transportation; and reducing vehicle miles traveled.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would conflict with the goals and strategies of AB 32 or the achievement of 1990 emission levels by 2020 beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

**XVIIb. Global Climate Change (Effects of Global Climate Change on the Project)**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would subject development associated with the Project to substantial climate-related risks to public health or safety?

YES

☐

NO

☒

As described above in XVIIa, implementation of the CAP and other policies and mitigations measures identified in the General Plan Program EIR would minimize contributing factors to global climate change. The nature of the projects anticipated with implementation of the CAP would likely include electricity-generating systems, construction of pedestrian and bicycle pathways, and retrofits of existing structures. These are not the types of projects or development that could expose people due to climate-related risks.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would subject development associated with the Project to substantial climate-related risks to public health or safety beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.

### **XVIII. Cumulative Impacts**

Since the previous EIR was certified, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would have effects on cumulatively considerable impacts (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

YES

☐

NO

☒

The primary purpose of implementing the CAP and the Significance Guidelines is to reduce cumulative effects on global climate change. Impacts to other resources may occur upon CAP implementation; however, as described throughout the analysis within this checklist, any potential impacts were found to be less than significant, and would not result in new or different circumstances than those analyzed within the General Plan Program EIR. Environmental impacts associated with implementing the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would be reduced by the same mitigation identified in the General Plan Program EIR. Through implementation of General Plan Program EIR policies, regulatory requirements, and mitigation measures, any impacts that could result from activities associated with the CAP would not contribute substantially to a cumulative impact.

For these reasons, implementation of the CAP and the Significance Guidelines would not create a change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or “new information of substantial importance” that would have effects on cumulatively considerable impacts beyond that anticipated in the General Plan Program EIR, as described in this checklist.